

The Solicitors' Journal.

LONDON, MARCH 18, 1882.

CURRENT TOPICS.

THE OPENING CEREMONY of the Royal Courts of Justice has been fixed provisionally for the first day of next Trinity Sittings.

MR. FRANCIS SAVAGE REILLY has been appointed Counsel to the Speaker of the House of Commons, in succession to Mr. G. K. RICKARDS, resigned. Mr. REILLY was called to the bar at Lincoln's-inn in Easter Term, 1851. He acted as arbitrator under the European Assurance Company's Arbitration Act.

GREAT PRESSURE is being applied to urge on the completion of the Royal Courts of Justice by the date suggested by Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE last week in the House of Commons. Large numbers of workmen have been employed in completing the details of the central hall and other unfinished portions of the building, and the fittings of the courts will shortly be placed in position.

THE HOUSE OF COMMONS has called for a return "showing the number of registrars, masters, and chief clerks attached to the Supreme Court of Judicature, and the salaries or fees received by, and the number and length of the days of actual attendance of, each registrar, master, and chief clerk during the year ending the 31st of October, 1881."

THE COMPLAINT of a correspondent in a recent number of this journal that deeds or documents cannot be stamped at the Royal Courts of Justice for either 2s. 6d. or 6d., although they can be stamped for various other amounts between 1s. and £5, deserves the attention of the authorities. The tell-tale stamping machines are somewhat expensive, but it would be worth while to incur the cost of two new machines to obviate the inconvenience caused to practitioners who have to go to Somerset House.

THE DIFFICULTIES which have from time to time arisen in the Court of Appeal with respect to the costs of shorthand notes of what took place in the court below have as to notes of the evidence, been settled by several cases, but as to shorthand notes of the judgment there appears to remain some uncertainty. In the case of *The London and South-Western Railway Company v. Gomm* (ante, p. 296), the Master of the Rolls is reported to have said that the court had read the report of the judgment of KAY, J., in a current series of reports, which had only been recently published, "but if the printed report had been published some time before the hearing of the appeal, the costs of the written copies of the judgment would not have been allowed." It is hard to understand the precise drift of this ruling if it extends to the costs of the transcript. Some reports are published weekly, others monthly, but no reports, whenever published, invariably contain all the cases reportable which have been decided since the last previous date of publication. It is impossible for solicitors to know whether a case which is going to the Court of Appeal will be reported at any given time. It will be asked, after what the Master of the Rolls has said, how long an appellant is to wait after his appeal is set down before he takes a transcript of the shorthand notes of the judgment? Some explanation of the rule laid down by the Master of the Rolls appears to be necessary.

IN REFERENCE to the convict LAMSON, it may be well to point out that, by the present law, property does not the less devolve upon a person because it has been procured by the murder of a person through whom the right to it accrues. Before 1870 the law was otherwise, as the whole of a felon's property was, by his conviction, *ipso facto* forfeited to the Crown. But the Act 33 & 34 Vict. c. 23 abolishes forfeiture for felony, and provides that the Crown may commit the custody and management of the property of a convict to an administrator, who, besides having power to pay the debts of the convict, and the costs of his prosecution and defence, "may (section 16) cause such payments and allowances for the support or maintenance of any wife or child, or reputed child of such convict, or of any other relative, or reputed relative, of such convict dependent upon him for support, as to such administrator shall seem fit." The provision of section 15, that the administrator may cause to be paid out of the property of the convict "such sum of money by way of satisfaction or compensation for any loss of property or other injury alleged to have been suffered by any person through, or by means of, any alleged criminal or fraudulent act of such convict as to him shall seem just, although no proof of such alleged criminal or fraudulent act may have been made in any court of law or equity," are very wide, and might, perhaps, include the case of compensation to the dependent relatives of a murdered person; but the case of devolution of property procured by murder is unprovided for, and is, perhaps, too rare to require providing for by law.

IT HAS BEEN SUGGESTED by the jury in the Lamson case that the sale of poisons ought to be more restricted than it is at present, and the suggestion appears to have sprung from the prevalent opinion that medical men can procure poisons more easily than other people. The Pharmacy Act provides (section 17) that certain poisons may not be sold "to any person unknown to the seller, unless introduced by some person known to the seller"; but that such provision shall not apply to "sales by wholesale to retail dealers in the ordinary course of wholesale dealing," nor to "any medicine supplied by a legally qualified apothecary to his patient," nor to "any article when forming part of the ingredients of any medicine dispensed by a person registered" under the Act. There is nothing in the Act authorizing the supply *ad libitum* of poison by chemists to medical practitioners as such. The case of *Berry v. Henderson* (L. R. 5 Q. B. 296), however, shows that a certain amount of laxity is allowed in the application of the law. There a person unknown, and not introduced, brought a prescription to be made up, which was signed by the initials of a medical man: and it was held that the dispensing chemist could not be convicted, although there was no evidence that the person for whom the prescription purported to be intended was an existing person. It would seem to be reasonable to require that the name and address of the prescribing medical practitioner should be furnished to the dispensing chemist. With respect to the sale of arsenic, it may be noticed that the exception in the Arsenic Act (14 & 15 Vict. c. 13) applies only to sale by prescription, or by wholesale to retail dealers, "upon orders in writing in the ordinary course of wholesale dealing," and the exception in the Pharmacy Act provides that where medicine containing poison is sold, it is to be "labelled with the name and address of the seller," and that the ingredients are to be entered "with the name of the person to whom it is sold or delivered, in a book to be kept by the seller for that purpose."

BOTH THE Criminal Law Amendment Bill, "to prescribe the procedure in England and Ireland relative to indictment or information for the punishment of offenders, and to provide appeal in criminal cases," which is brought in by Mr. HORWOOD

and other members, and the Criminal Procedure Bill, "to prescribe the procedure by indictment for the punishment of offences against the criminal law," which is brought in by Mr. GORST and Mr. ARTHUR BALFOUR, reproduce, to a very great extent, and often word for word, the provisions of part 7 of the well-known Criminal Code (Indictable Offences) Bill. The Amendment Bill contains 133 clauses, the Procedure Bill 110. Following in the main the order of their model, they deal with committal by justices and bail, with the whole of criminal pleading, with the mode of trial and challenges of the jury, and with appeal, new trial, and costs. In neither of the Bills is there any schedule of repealed Acts, though it is obvious that there is an implied repeal of some score of them, the so-called "Indictable Offences Act, 1848" (Jervis's Act, No. 1, 11 & 12 Vict. c. 42), being the most important of them. There are many new provisions, however, of more or less interest, the principal novelty being a very stringent clause as to the power of search. The clause which gives power to examine defendants is to be found in the Amendment Bill only, which provides, in quite different phraseology from that of the Criminal Code (Indictable Offences) Bill, that "everyone proceeded against by indictment for any offence shall be a competent witness for himself or herself [why this provision for a female defendant, looking to 13 & 14 Vict. c. 21?] upon his or her trial for such offence, and the wife or husband, as the case may be, of every such accused person shall be a competent witness for him or her, or with his or her consent for any other [sic] jointly indicted with him or her upon such trial; provided that no such person shall be liable to be called as a witness by the prosecutor, but every such witness called and giving evidence on behalf of the accused shall be liable to be cross-examined, like any other witness on any other matter, though not arising out of his examination in chief. Provided that so far as the cross-examination relates to the credit of the accused, the court may limit such cross-examination to such extent as it thinks proper, though the proposed cross-examination might be permissible in the case of any other witness." The wording is clumsy, but the intention is good.

IF THE PRESSURE of business should prevent any large alteration of the criminal law in the present session, we would express an earnest hope that that small portion of the two Criminal Law Amendment Bills, or of the Criminal Code, which deals with pleading only, may be passed. As the law at present stands, it is still necessary, when a person is indicted for publishing a libellous book, to copy out in the indictment all the passages alleged to be libellous. The amending Bills propose (see Criminal Code, Form Q. Q.) to allege in the indictment that the defendant published a libellous book, and to annex a marked copy of the book to the indictment. Other, but not quite so obvious, amendments of the present ridiculous system of pleading will occur to everybody versed in the subject. As for the Criminal Code itself, the reason why it has made so slow a progress in the House of Commons is plain. Since the brilliant opening speech of Lord Justice HOLKER in introducing the measure about three years ago, the House of Commons has never had the slightest opportunity of considering it. The view that the House of Commons can no more make a code than paint a picture has been pressed too far, and the Bill was referred prematurely to the Royal Commission. We hope that it may be introduced and discussed early, and be referred to a joint select committee of the two Houses of Parliament.

MR. EDWARD COOPER WILLIS, has been appointed one of her Majesty's Counsel. MR. E. C. WILLIS was called to the bar in 1865.

On the 10th inst., in the House of Commons, Mr. Hicks asked the Attorney-General whether he had now come to a decision as to the way in which he would deal with the present waste of judicial power, and the great inconveniences caused to jurors and others by the present system of holding four assizes. The Attorney-General said that he saw no reason for departing from the system that no one should remain in custody without trial for a longer period than three months. But it was under the consideration of the Government how far the inconvenience resulting to the judicial bench and to jurors might be mitigated.

THE LIMIT TO THE DOCTRINE OF TULK v. MOXHAY.

FROM a very early period in the history of English law, covenants of certain kinds relating to land have possessed the peculiar property that the obligation created by them was not merely personal to the covenantor, but might also, under appropriate circumstances, bind the representative in title of the covenantor to whom the land had passed by assignment. The doctrine of the common law upon this subject is exceedingly obscure, and the highest authorities are much divided in opinion with regard to it. But, so far as concerns the most numerous and important class of these cases, the common law has, for three and a half centuries, been superseded by the statute 32 Hen. 8, c. 34; and this in turn, though not repealed, has, at least to a great extent, been superseded by sections 10, 11, and 12 of the Conveyancing Act, 1881.

These covenants are said to run with the land at law, and the cases which involve their consideration may be divided into two principal classes, according as there is, or is not, privity of estate between the covenantor and the covenantee. The former class embraces those cases in which the covenant is between the lessee and his lessor. The latter division embraces those much more obscure and difficult cases, of which *The Prior's case*, cited by Lord Coke in *Spencer's case*, is the prototype, where no privity of estate, in respect of the lands affected by the covenant, subsists between the covenantor and the covenantee. These last covenants are still subject to the common law, so far as regards their capacity to run with the land to which they relate. The rules by which they are governed are exceedingly obscure and of very limited application; and we do not propose to enter upon the investigation of them.

The statute of Hen. 8, c. 34, which largely extended the benefit of these covenants, as between lessor and lessee, by largely extending the circumstances under which they could be sued upon, did not at all extend the scope of the covenants in the sense of causing any covenants to run with the land which would not equally have run with the land before the statute. Though the words of the statute are very wide, they were reasonably restricted by the courts to this meaning; see *Spencer's case*, *ad fin.*

The definition of these covenants remained drawn upon the narrow lines of the common law. The same need which had originally operated to obtain from the common law a limited recognition of the principle of running with the land, became much more pressing with the progress of time in consequence of the increasing number of ways in which land could be, and frequently was, employed. In particular, the common law rules were very inadequate to meet the requirements of owners and hirers of building lands, when these became the subject of extensive operations. It was probably a sense of this need, much more than the somewhat doubtful considerations of equity urged by Lord Cottenham in his judgment, which both gave rise to the decision of *Tulk v. Moxhay* (2 Phill. 774), and also procured for that decision the almost unparalleled run of success which it afterwards met with. The principle there laid down has been continually pushing its ramifications in all directions. This principle, in its most general shape, may be expressed by saying that a covenant relating to land, but not by the rules of law running with the land, shall in equity bind the terre-tenant if he took the land with notice of the covenant. The doctrine was not only laid down in very wide terms by Lord Justice Knight Bruce in *De Mattos v. Gibson* (4 De G. & J. 276), but its application was apparently extended to all property whatever. "Reason and justice," he observed, "seem to prescribe that, at least as a general rule, where a man, by gift or purchase, acquires property from another, with knowledge of a previous contract, lawfully and for valuable consideration made by him with a third person, to use and employ the property for a particular purpose in a specified manner, the acquirer shall not, to the material damage of the third person, in opposition to the contract and inconsistently with it, use and employ the property in a manner not allowable to the giver or seller." In that case the property in question was a ship; and it was laid down that a legal mortgagee having taken his charge with notice of a contract of charter-party previously made by the mortgagor, might be restrained from using the ship inconsistently with the contract;

and an *interim* injunction to that effect was actually granted, though it afterwards happened, owing to peculiar circumstances, that the Bill was dismissed. The above cited passage, which obviously includes all chattels in its scope, was quoted with approval by Lord Justice Selwyn in *Catt v. Tourle* (L. R. 4 Ch. 654, at p. 657). The earlier case of *Wilson v. Hart* (L. R. 1 Ch. 463), had decided that constructive notice is sufficient to bring a purchaser within the meaning of the principle. It is evident that the two last-mentioned cases contain within them the germs of a very wide development; and the courts for a good many years showed no signs of intending to restrict their growth.

But a remarkable step has recently been taken in this direction by the case of *Haywood v. Brunswick Permanent Benefit Building Society* (30 W. R. 299). The facts of this case, so far as they are material, were as follows:—In 1866 Charles Jackson granted certain lands in fee simple to Edward Jackson, partly in consideration of a rent-charge limited in fee simple to Charles Jackson by way of use, and partly in consideration of the covenants on the part of Edward Jackson contained in the deed. Among these covenants was a covenant to pay the rent-charge, and another, expressed to be entered into by Edward Jackson "for himself, his heirs, executors, and administrators," that he would, within two years, erect and keep in repair buildings of the annual letting value of double the rent-charge. The rent-charge, with all the remedies in respect of it, was afterwards assigned to the plaintiff, and the lands were legally mortgaged to the defendant society, who subsequently entered into possession. The society having in 1880 failed to pay the rent-charge and to keep the buildings in repair, an action was brought, among other things, for an injunction to restrain the defendants from committing further breaches of the covenant to repair, and to compel specific performance of that covenant. Mr. Justice Stephen gave judgment for the plaintiff, holding that, though the covenant did not at law run with the land, yet the defendants, being mortgagees in possession, and having had notice of the covenant, were bound to perform it. This judgment was unanimously reversed by the Court of Appeal, consisting of Brett, Cotton, and Lindley, L.J., upon the ground that the covenant did not at law run with the land, and that the doctrine of *Tulk v. Moxhay* is applicable only to restrictive covenants forbidding the user of the land in certain prescribed ways—possibly (according to Lord Justice Brett) with the addition of such covenants as, when enforced, would constitute a burden upon the land. This decision has very recently been referred to with approval by the Court of Appeal in the case of *The London and South Western Railway Company v. Gomm* (ante, p. 296).

It is certainly a remarkable thing that in cases where, as in *Tulk v. Moxhay* itself, the covenant was partly of an affirmative character, binding the covenantor positively to do something, including, *inter alia*, an obligation to keep a piece of ground in good repair as a pleasure-garden, the injunction of the court seems to have dealt only with that part of it which was of a negative character. The injunction in that case did not attempt to compel the defendant to keep the garden in repair, but only restrained him from building upon it or using it otherwise than as a pleasure-garden. This distinction seems to have been present to the mind of Lord Chancellor Cranworth when, in *De Mattos v. Gibson*, he said:—"Although a court of equity cannot compel a specific performance of the contract" (which was in that case a positive contract of charter-party), "yet it will restrain the employment of the vessel in a different manner."

It must be borne in mind that the doctrine of *Tulk v. Moxhay* and its attendant cases has never yet come for review before the House of Lords. Probably this fact may be taken as a fresh evidence that on the whole the doctrine is salutary and consonant with public convenience. But some of its later extensions, notably the two to which we have above adverted, look as though they might perhaps not pass unscathed through the ordeal of the supreme tribunal. Meanwhile we may remind the reader of the opinion formerly expressed by us, that section 65 of the Conveyancing Act has, though evidently without intending it, supplied a convenient machinery for binding lands in perpetuity by such covenants as are commonly used by owners of building land.

The incandescent electric light is to be tried in the new courts at the Royal Courts of Justice.

THE BILLS OF SALE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

THE somewhat crude Bill introduced in the House of Commons in 1881 to amend the Bills of Sale Act was, as our readers are aware, referred to a Select Committee, who, after hearing a great mass of evidence and considering the replies to the circular sent by the Lord Chancellor to the county court judges and registrars, amended the Bill and reported it to the House. The Bill made no further progress, but this session it has been re-introduced by Mr. Monk, and in its present form it deserves the careful attention of our readers.

One of the most important proposals is that of clauses 4, 5, and 6, the effect of which, if passed into law, will be to do away with the practice of including after-acquired property in bills of sale. It is proposed to provide that:—

"(4.) Every bill of sale shall have annexed thereto, or written thereon, a schedule containing an inventory of the personal chattels comprised in the bill of sale; and such bill of sale, save as hereinafter mentioned, shall have effect only in respect of the personal chattels enumerated in the said schedule; and shall be void in respect of any personal chattels not so enumerated.

"(5.) Save as hereinafter mentioned, a bill of sale shall be void in respect of any personal chattels enumerated in the schedule thereto of which the grantor was not the true owner at the time of the execution of the bill of sale.

"(6.) Nothing contained in the foregoing sections of this Act shall render a bill of sale void in respect of any of the following things; (that is to say),

"(1) Any growing crops separately assigned or charged where such crops were actually growing at the time when the bill of sale was executed.

"(2) Any fixtures separately assigned or charged, and any plant or trade machinery where such fixtures, plant, or trade machinery are used in, attached to, or brought upon any land, farm, factory, workshop, shop, house, warehouse, or other place in substitution for any of the like fixtures, plant, or trade machinery enumerated in the schedule to such bill of sale."

As to the policy of this proposal, opinions differ widely, but we think that many who are favourable to it will admit that, as at present framed, the clauses are too sweeping. The effect will probably be to abolish altogether bills of sale of stock-in-trade, for, since the scheduled articles will be disposed of in the way of trade, of course, the security of the creditor will be constantly diminishing. We do not, however, object to this. There is a great deal to be urged in favour of abolishing altogether bills of sale of stock-in-trade, whether present or future. As has been several times pointed out in these columns, it is tolerably certain that a trader who gives such a bill of sale is involved in serious embarrassment, and the bill of sale very seldom enables him to tide over his difficulties. Wholesale dealers generally rely on the stock-in-trade of their customers as a test of the amount of credit they will give. The result is that bills of sale of stock-in-trade do little good to the trader, and occasion great loss to his trade creditors. If, therefore, the proposal of the Bill were confined to the stock-in-trade of traders, as defined in the Bankruptcy Act, we should be disposed to give it our support. But is there any solid reason for preventing a man who is not a trader from dealing with his present or future property as he may think fit? There is a large class of persons who make a livelihood by letting furnished lodgings (without supplying provisions to their lodgers) who would probably be seriously inconvenienced if the provision as it now stands is passed into law. They can usually only obtain credit upon their furniture, and cannot pay off the debt rapidly, and the value of the security will probably be greatly diminished if it is only to extend to the furniture and effects scheduled in the bill of sale which are constantly wearing out. There ought, at all events, to be inserted a provision excepting from the operation of the clauses we have referred to effects brought upon the premises in substitution for articles enumerated in the schedule.

Clause 7 is intended to convert into law the decision of the Common Pleas Division in *Davis v. Goodman* (28 W. R. 150), afterwards reversed by the Court of Appeal. It is proposed to repeal section 8 of the Act of 1878, which avoids an unattested and unregistered bill of sale in certain cases only, and to provide that "every bill of sale shall be duly attested, and shall be registered under the principal Act within seven days after the execution thereof, . . . and shall truly set forth the consideration for which it was given, otherwise such bill of sale shall be void in respect of the personal chattels comprised therein."

The next clause is one which deserves careful attention. It provides that "a bill of sale shall be void unless the same is executed in the presence of a person who has authority to take oaths in the Supreme Court of Judicature in England, and, if the bill is executed in England, who is also a certificated solicitor, and such person shall state in the attestation of the execution of the bill of sale that he has before the execution of the bill of sale carefully explained to the grantor the nature and effect of the bill of sale, and further, if the bill is to be executed in England, that he was appointed by the grantor to be, and is, the solicitor of the grantor." The effect of this will obviously be to introduce considerable difficulty in the execution of bills of sale in country districts. The commissioner for oaths will have to be hunted up, and if he is away or engaged, the execution must be postponed. Take, for instance (opening the *Law List* at random) the important town of Accrington, in Lancashire. There are stated to be only two commissioners for oaths there; is it at all unlikely that both may be away on many days? If the clause should be passed as at present drawn, the number of commissioners must be largely increased, and then where will be the guarantee, supposed to be afforded by the provision, of a certain extra trustworthiness in the attesting witness? The provision as to the attesting witness being appointed the solicitor of the grantor will increase the cost of the transaction, for the solicitor will apparently have to obtain a formal appointment by the grantor. If he is formally appointed the grantor's solicitor, he will be responsible to him for the propriety of the provisions of the deed, hence he will have to peruse and approve of it in the usual way.

Clause 9 establishes a system of local registration of bills of sale with the registrars of the county courts, which will, we think, be a considerable improvement.

The next clause provides that every bill of sale made or given in consideration of any sum under £50 shall be void. The evidence before the committee showed the enormous prevalence of bills of sale for amounts under £20, and no question can arise as to their evil effect; but we are not clear as to the expediency of the remedy proposed. It is a question whether the effect will not be to encourage in many cases the advance of sums just over the statutory amount at increased rates of interest.

Clause 11 strikes at the root of most of the evils which have arisen from the new law by providing that

"Where a person, within twelve months after he has executed a bill of sale, becomes subject to the provisions of the law for the time being in force relating to bankruptcy or any similar proceeding, whether he is adjudged bankrupt or has his affairs liquidated by arrangement, or enters into a composition or otherwise, such bill of sale shall, as against the trustee or other person entitled to the estate of such person under the said law, be void in respect of any personal chattels which, at or after the commencement of the bankruptcy or liquidation or other date at or to which the proceedings under the said law are deemed to commence or to relate, are in the possession or apparent possession, or the order and disposition, of the person executing such bill of sale."

There can be no doubt that it is the security given to the registered holder by the provision of the Act of 1878 taking chattels comprised in a registered bill of sale out of the order and disposition clause of the Bankruptcy Act, which has mainly attracted the attention of the money-lenders to bills of sale.

On the report of the Conveyancing Bill in the House of Lords, Lord Coleridge drew attention to the clause of the Bill which proposed to abolish the office and all the machinery for taking the acknowledgments of married women. He should submit to their lordships that the abolition of this office was unwise and inexpedient. The whole scheme and the functions of the commissioners was regulated by Act of Parliament, and, so far as he knew, the law in many cases operated for the protection of persons who ought to have a certain protection thrown over them. The scheme was very inexpensive, and he believed that the judicial bench was in favour of the retention of the present system. He submitted that it was hardly worth while under the circumstances to abolish this office. Earl Cairns said that for many years there had been a great feeling that the system of the acknowledgment of the deeds of married women was entirely useless and very expensive. He did not speak of the fees paid to the commissioners, but in order to take an acknowledgment complicated machinery had to be set to work and solicitors employed, and, as a consequence, great expense was occasioned. He regarded the present system of taking acknowledgments as one which caused great expense and was productive of no advantage whatever.

REVIEWS.

ROMAN DUTCH LAW.

SIMON VAN LEEUWEN'S COMMENTARIES ON ROMAN DUTCH LAW. Revised and edited, with Notes, by C. W. DECKER, Advocate. Translated from the original Dutch by J. G. KOTZÉ, Barrister-at-law, Chief Justice of the Transvaal. Vol. 1. Stevens & Haynes.

The Roman Dutch law, it may perhaps be necessary to explain to some of our readers, is the common law of our colonies of Ceylon, Guiana, and South Africa. In Ceylon Van Leeuwen's work has long been the text-book, a translation into English having been published with special reference to the wants of that colony. In South Africa, and, as Mr. Kotzé tells us, especially in the Transvaal, the Commentaries of Van Leeuwen is one of the works prescribed for the guidance of the courts. Mr. Kotzé has for the first time translated into English the Notes to the Commentaries by Decker. We cannot pretend to judge of the translation from the original Dutch, but we can testify to the terseness of the language in which the English version is expressed. Here and there it would appear that Van Leeuwen has not very clearly expressed his meaning. We think that most readers of the commencement of his dissertation "of the different kinds of wills and codicils" will agree with Decker that the section is "very unintelligible." The translator has added useful notes of his own relating to decisions of the Privy Council and the South African courts, and other authorities. The book bears marks throughout of great care, and will unquestionably take its place as the standard English work on Roman Dutch law.

FIXTURES.

THE LAW OF FIXTURES IN THE PRINCIPAL RELATION OF LANDLORD AND TENANT, AND IN ALL THE OTHER OR GENERAL RELATIONS. By ARCHIBALD BROWN, Barrister-at-Law. FOURTH EDITION. Stevens & Haynes.

We have delayed too long our notice of this new edition of Mr. Brown's useful work. The main changes consist in the statement of the provisions of the Bills of Sale Act, 1878, with reference to fixtures; and of the recent decisions as to the effect of disclaimer by a trustee in bankruptcy upon the right to the fixtures. Mr. Brown states very well and fully the cases on this subject, but refrains from commenting upon them. A new chapter has been added on the law as to ecclesiastical fixtures, or, rather, on the law of dilapidations as bearing on the subject of fixtures. May we be allowed to suggest that the pleasure of the reader would be increased if Mr. Brown would adopt a somewhat simpler style of phraseology. For instance, in the first paragraph of his new chapter, it does not conduce to the edification of the reader to be told of "any structure which, as being either of a strictly agricultural or of a barely necessary and complementary character, has coalesced with . . . the house."

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE CONVEYANCING ACT, 1881.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,—I am one of those who, on first reading your remarks upon the Conveyancing Act, were disposed to think that you were not treating it quite fairly; but a little experience of its working has convinced me that you have really rendered a valuable service in pointing out that it is unsafe to rely on its provisions as superseding the established forms.

The provision (section 3) that the production of the receipt for the last payment of rent shall be evidence of the observance of all covenants is qualified by the words "unless the contrary appears," and seems thus to leave it open to a purchaser to give evidence of a house being out of repair in resistance to a claim for specific performance.

The provisions (sections 3, 13) exempting a lessor or vendor of leaseholds from producing his title only apply to the cases noticed by you, and leave it incumbent on the contracting party to prove that he comes within one of them, and that he is not granting a lease under a power in a settlement, or dealing with a lease so granted.

The general words (section 6) are defective in the matter of easements as pointed out by you.

The covenant for quiet enjoyment in a mortgage (section 7) is curiously worded so as to suggest an implication against the mortgagee taking possession when no interest is in arrear; and the covenant for further assurance at the cost of the mortgagor is limited so as to determine when the mortgagee contracts to sell the property. Consequently, any act of further assurance that may be required to complete the title to a purchaser can only be obtained on paying the cost of it.

The provisions respecting mortgages of leaseholds take no account of the last day of the term, which is always left in the mortgagor.

The provision (section 21) relating to the surplus proceeds of sale of

mortgaged property directs it to be paid to the person entitled to the mortgaged property, or authorized to give receipts for the proceeds of sale thereof; which defines no one at all, unless it be the purchaser of the property, which is absurd.

The section (31) relating to the appointment of new trustees omits to clear away the doubt whether a person named trustee in a will, who disclaims, is a trustee within the meaning of the clause; or rather the words of the section enhance the doubt which formerly existed.

The Act professes (section 65) to allow a long term to be enlarged into a fee, when there was originally no pecuniary rent reserved, or a rent was reserved, but "has become barred by lapse of time"; while the law is that rent can never become barred by lapse of time.

The section (61) inserting a joint-account clause into every mortgage authorizes the mortgagor to pay the money to the surviving mortgagee, although he has notice of a severance of the jointure; thus discharging a debtor by payment to one whom he knows not to be his proper creditor.

What with negating this clause, and the clauses relating to consolidation and leasing, and curing the other flaws above pointed out, a mortgage under the new Act must run to nearly as great a length as under the old law, and be less satisfactory, since its operation is less certainly known.

PRUDENS.

[To avoid misapprehension it may be well to add that our correspondent is an entirely independent witness.—*Ed. S. J.*]

THE MARRIED WOMEN'S PROPERTY BILL.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,—The fact that this Bill was read a second time in the House of Lords on Tuesday suggests that no time should be lost in calling attention to one anomaly in this most anomalous branch of law which is but imperfectly remedied by the proposed enactment.

As your readers are aware, section 6 of the Act of 1870 provides that personal property to which a woman, married after the passing of the Act, shall, during her marriage, become entitled as next of kin of an intestate shall belong to her for her separate use, while the next section provides that, in case of real estate descending upon her as heirress of an intestate, she shall have the rents and profits only for her separate use, although from the marginal note it is evident that the draftsman intended the absolute interest to belong to her.

The effect of this anomaly has just been exemplified in my own practice.

A lady client, married in 1875, inherited last year real property of considerable value. She has four infant children, one a son. On her death this child will, of course, in the absence of express provision, succeed to the entire property to the exclusion of the other three. My client wishes to prevent this by her will, but, of course, she is utterly powerless to do so, and her husband, if he survived her, would be equally so. The only way in which her object can be effected is by resorting to the cumbrous and costly procedure of the Fines and Recoveries Act and conveying the property to trustees, to be held upon such trusts as she shall by will appoint. Had the property been leasehold there would, of course, have been no impediment in the way of free testamentary disposition.

The Lord Chancellor deals with this anomaly by providing in section 3 of his Bill that every woman married before the commencement of the Act shall be entitled to hold as her separate property all real and personal property, her title to which shall accrue after the commencement of the Act, which is fixed to take place on the 1st of January, 1882. But why, if the provision be a proper one, and if its effect is to be retrospective at all, should that retrospective operation be limited to a few weeks, and thus the beneficial effect of the Act be denied to hundreds whose position is similar to that of my client?

March 9.

A SOLICITOR.

An American telegram states that the President has nominated Mr. Samuel Blatchford, judge of the Circuit Court, New York, as justice of the Supreme Court, to fill the place which Mr. Conkling recently declined.

Mr. Chamberlain announced in the House of Commons, on Thursday evening last, that the Government Bankruptcy Bill would not be introduced before Easter.

The office of clerk of the peace for the East Riding of Yorkshire has been accepted by Mr. Bickersteth, barrister, with the condition that Mr. Joseph Wilkinson, town clerk of York, is to hold the position of deputy-clerk.

Up to Monday, says the *Times*, 103 Bills have been introduced into the House of Commons since the commencement of the present session. Of that number fifteen are Government measures and the remainder are promoted by private members. Only two Bills have yet gone through all their stages and received the Royal assent; eighty are ready for second reading; two have passed the House of Commons; one originated in the Upper House; ten have reached the Committee stage, and three have been referred to the Examiners.

CASES OF THE WEEK.

RESCISSION OF CONTRACT FOR SALE—MISREPRESENTATION—INQUIRIES MADE BY PURCHASER—ONUS PROBANDI THAT REPRESENTATIONS OF VENDOR WERE NOT RELIED ON—PLEADING—SOLICITOR MADE PARTY FOR COSTS.—In a case of *Mathias v. Yells*, before the Court of Appeal (JESSEL, M.R., Sir JAMES HANNEN, and LINDLEY, L.J.), on the 13th inst., the action being to set aside a sale of a sum of consols, which had been invested to provide for the costs which might arise in a pending suit in the Chancery Division, on the ground that misrepresentations had been made by the principal defendant, the court reiterated what was laid down in the recent case of *Redgrave v. Hurd* (ante, p. 74)—viz., that when a vendor has made material representations as to the value of the property sold, and the purchaser seeks to set aside the sale on the ground that the representations were untrue, the onus is, not on the purchaser to prove that he relied on the representations, but on the vendor to prove that he did not. JESSEL, M.R., referred to the recent case of *Brownlie v. Campbell* (L.R. 5 App. Cas. 925) as laying down the law on the subject. If a material representation was one which, from its nature, might induce the purchaser to act upon it, then there was an inference that he did act upon it, and, if it was untrue, the defendant was liable, unless he could prove that the plaintiff did not in fact rely on it, or that he had in effect said that he did not care about the representation, but would take the risk. The vendor could not say to the purchaser, You might have inquired, and, if you had, you would have found out that what I said was untrue; nor could he say, You made some inquiries, if you had been more diligent you would have discovered everything. The question was whether the defendant had made a representation knowing it to be untrue, or whether he had taken on himself to make a statement without inquiring whether it was true or false, though he had the means of satisfying himself whether it was true or false. And, during the argument, JESSEL, M.R., said that in an action of this kind it was not necessary for the plaintiff to allege in his pleading that he relied on the truth of a material statement, the presumption being that, if it was material, he did rely on it.

The solicitor to the principal defendant was also made a defendant to the action, but he had not made any representation to the plaintiff, and had not even prepared the conditions of sale. He was, as JESSEL, M.R., said, made a defendant to the action only because he had acted as solicitor to the principal defendant, with the view of making him liable for costs. And, as had been said many years ago by Lord Cottenham, and more recently by Lord Selborne, it was improper to make a solicitor a defendant to an action for such a purpose, and the practice ought to be discouraged. The action had been rightly dismissed as against the solicitor, with costs.—SOLICITORS, *Mason & Edwards; T. Hay; Brooks, Jenkins, & Co.*

COMPOSITION RESOLUTIONS—REGISTRATION—EXAMINATION OF DEBTOR AT MEETINGS—PRESENCE OF SHORTHAND WRITER—STATEMENT OF AFFAIRS—SUFFICIENCY—IRREGULARITY IN PROCEEDINGS—LEAVE TO SUMMON FRESH FIRST MEETING—BANKRUPTCY ACT, 1869, s. 126—BANKRUPTCY RULES, 1870, r. 295.—In a case of *Ex parte Solomon*, before the Court of Appeal on the 9th inst., the question arose whether a creditor, who desires to examine his debtor at a meeting under a liquidation petition filed by the debtor, is entitled to have a shorthand writer present at the meeting to take down the debtor's answers, and whether, if the meeting refuses to allow this, the resolutions passed are of any validity as against dissenting creditors. A debtor having filed a liquidation petition, one of his creditors instructed his solicitor to attend the meetings under the petition as his proxy. The solicitor desired to examine the debtor about his affairs, and he attended the first meeting, taking with him a clerk who could write shorthand, for the purpose of making notes of the debtor's answers. At the meeting the solicitor commenced examining the debtor, and the clerk made notes of his answers. Some one called the attention of the chairman to the fact that a reporter was present, and the chairman then asked the clerk whether he was a creditor or a proxy for a creditor. The clerk replied that he was not, and the solicitor then explained that he was there by his instructions to take notes of the debtor's examination. The chairman said that this was an irregular proceeding, and put it to the meeting whether they desired that the clerk should remain or not. The meeting, by a large majority, resolved that the clerk should withdraw, and he then left the room. The solicitor continued his examination, but no notes of the debtor's answers were taken by anyone. The creditors resolved by the statutory majority to accept a composition of 2s. 6d. in the pound, the solicitor, as proxy for his client, dissenting. At the second meeting the solicitor again attended. He wished to examine the debtor again, and took with him a professional shorthand writer to make notes of the debtor's answers, but the meeting excluded the shorthand writer in the same way as they had excluded the clerk at the first meeting, and the solicitor declined to ask the debtor any more questions. The resolutions passed at the first meeting were confirmed, the solicitor, as proxy for his client, again dissenting. The registration of the resolutions was opposed by the dissentient creditor, on the ground (*inter alia*) that he and his proxy were at both the meetings prevented from having a proper examination of the debtor and from having such examination taken down in writing. Mr. Registrar Pepps overruled the objections, and ordered the resolutions to be registered. The Court of Appeal (JESSEL, M.R., and COTTON and LINDLEY, L.J.J.) held that the resolutions ought not to have been registered, and ordered the registration to be vacated. It was urged that no request had been made to the chairman to take notes of the examination, and that it was his duty to take notes if requested to do so; that the meeting was a meeting of creditors, and that no one but a creditor, or his proxy, had a right to be present, and that, if every creditor who wished to examine a debtor was entitled to bring a shorthand writer to take notes, great inconvenience would

arise. JESSEL, M.R., said that, though the Act was silent as to who might be present at the meetings, it had always been the practice to allow the debtor's solicitor to be present to protect him, and this was a rational practice. His lordship believed that it was also usual, when an accountant had been employed by the debtor, to allow him or his clerk to be present. How was it possible for justice to be done if no record upon which the registrar could act was kept of the debtor's evidence given at the meeting? Was it rational not to allow an examining creditor to have a shorthand writer present to take notes of what the debtor said? His lordship thought that it was wholly irrational. It was no part of the chairman's duty to take notes. It was said that every creditor might want to have a shorthand writer. That was not very likely, for the employment of a shorthand writer was a very expensive matter. But, supposing that twenty creditors had brought twenty shorthand writers, it would be reasonable for the meeting to say that only two should be allowed to be present. That was an answer to this suggestion. The proceedings in the present case had been wholly irregular, and on this ground alone the registration of the resolutions should have been disallowed. CORROON, L.J., said that by section 126 great power was given to the majority of the creditors, but they must be strictly watched in the exercise of it, and they must strictly follow the directions of the Act. One of those directions was that the debtor should be present at the meetings, and should answer any inquiries made of him. He must also produce a statement of his assets and debts, and in *Ex parte Aaronson* (26 W. R. 470, L. R. 7 Ch. D. 713) it was decided that his answers to questions put to him at the meetings would go before the registrar as part of his statement of affairs. The directions of the Act, as explained by that decision, implied that some note in writing must be made of the examination, and in questions of figures it was of the utmost importance to the examining creditor that he should have a written note to refer to. In his lordship's opinion, the exclusion of the shorthand writers in this case was entirely wrong. It was urged that the meeting was to be a meeting of creditors. But the Act nowhere said that no one else was to be present, if his presence was essential for reasonably conducting the proceedings. And, in his lordship's opinion, it was essential—not, indeed, that every creditor should have a shorthand writer present, but that there should be some reasonable means of making a record in writing of the debtor's answers. LINDLEY, L.J., thought the proceedings at both the meetings had been so conducted as not to be fair to the dissentient creditors. There was no real opportunity of examining the debtor, and the conduct of the majority, in excluding that assistance of which the examining creditor stood in need, was unreasonable.

Another objection to the registration which the court held to be fatal arose in this way. The debtor was a solicitor, and had carried on business in partnership, but the partnership had been dissolved just before the filing of the petition, and the business was thenceforth carried on by the other partner alone, who was to receive the assets and to pay the debts of the firm. In his statement of affairs the debtor, in the list of book-debts due to his late firm, had made the following entry and nothing more:—"The book-debts of my late firm, so far as I have the means of ascertaining, the greater part being actions and suits which are pending, and other matters in progress, which I estimate to realize about £9,500. The costs outstanding, forming the above, in most cases are neither made out nor taxed." JESSEL, M.P., said that to call this a statement was simply ludicrous; the debtor by it pledged himself to nothing. He ought to have given the names of the debtors, and, where the bills of costs had been made out, he should have stated the amounts, and, in other cases, he should have given an estimate. He should have applied to his late partner for the necessary information. If, however, for any reason, it was impossible for him to make a sufficient statement, the only result would be that he could not have a liquidation by arrangement or a composition, but must be made a bankrupt.

The question then arose whether the court would allow the debtor to summon a fresh first meeting of his creditors. And it was urged on behalf of the dissentient creditors that the court would only allow this to be done in a case where there had been a slip in the proceedings, and that here the majority had deliberately gone wrong. JESSEL, M.R., thought there had been nothing more than an irregularity. He could see no evidence of *mala fides*. The offer of a composition of 2s. 6d. might be a fair one, but at present the court had no means of judging whether it was so or not. By reason of an irregularity the resolutions could not be registered. But, seeing that the great majority of the creditors desired to have a composition, why should the debtor be driven into bankruptcy? Of course, if the debtor had been guilty of gross misconduct, the court would not give him a new chance of escaping bankruptcy. But, considering the wishes of the majority of the creditors, and that the debtor had not been guilty of any misconduct, he ought to be allowed to summon a fresh first meeting of his creditors. The court, accordingly, ordered that a fresh first meeting should be summoned, and gave leave to use at it the proofs and proxies which were already on the file. They also said that, if a composition was resolved upon, the costs would be paid by the debtor; otherwise, they would be paid out of his estate.—SOLICITORS, A. S. Jonas; Dubois & Reid.

RAILWAY COMPANY—COMPULSORY POWERS TO PURCHASE LAND—ACCOMMODATION WORKS—RAILWAYS CLAUSES ACT, 1845, ss. 16, 68.—In a case of *Wilkinson v. The Hull and Barnsley Railway Company*, before the Court of Appeal on the 10th inst., the question arose whether a railway company could use their compulsory powers of taking land for the purpose of taking land from one landowner in order to construct accommodation works for another landowner. The railway of the defendant company was carried by an embankment over and intersected land of the plaintiff, and also of one Davy, the owner of adjoining land. It was proposed by the company to provide access between the severed portions of the plaintiff's land by an archway under the embankment which abutted upon his land; and in order to give Davy the benefit of this communication, without making a second accommodation archway, the company had served the plaintiff with notice to

treat for two strips of land on either side of the line, upon which they proposed to make a roadway from and to Davy's land, passing under the accommodation archway. These strips of land were comprised in the lands shown on the company's deposited plans. The action was brought to restrain the company from taking the plaintiff's land for this purpose, on the ground that they were not taking the land for the purposes of their undertaking, but in order to save themselves the expense of making the obvious and more convenient communication by a second archway directly between the severed portions of Davy's land. Kay, J., granted an injunction, but his decision was reversed by the Court of Appeal (JESSEL, M.R., and CORROON and LINDLEY, L.J.). JESSEL, M.R., said that the real question was whether taking the plaintiff's land for the purpose of making these accommodation works for Davy was taking it for the purposes of the company's undertaking, and, if there had been no decisions on the point, his lordship, on the words of the Act, should have come to the conclusion that the taking of land by a railway company for the purpose of constructing works which they were liable to make, or which they were empowered to make, was a taking of it for the purposes of their undertaking. In section 16 of the Railways Clauses Act no distinction was made between the railway itself and accommodation works, and by section 68 the company were compelled to make certain works "for the accommodation of the owners and occupiers of land adjoining the railway (*inter alia*), such and so many convenient gates, bridges, arches, culverts, and passages over, under, or by the sides of, or leading to or from, the railway as shall be necessary for the purposes of making good any interruption caused by the railway to the use of the lands through which the railway shall be made." If the company could make good such interruptions in two or three ways, who was to decide which method should be adopted? Clearly the company, acting upon the advice of their engineer; and if the method proposed should not be convenient to the landowner, power was given to him by section 69 to apply to two justices. But, provided the method was convenient to the landowner, it appeared clear that the company had the power of determining which method should be adopted. In the present case the landowner for whose benefit the proposed accommodation works were to be made did not object, but the landowner whose land was to be taken objected. The company said that, if the communication was made in the way suggested by the plaintiff, it would be highly inconvenient, as, in order to make this second archway, they must either raise their embankment or lower the road so as to expose it to the risk of being flooded. In the one case there would be serious inconveniences to the company, in the other to the landowner. How could it be said that the land proposed to be taken was not required for the purposes of the undertaking? Independently of any decisions, his lordship was of opinion that the company had power to take the land. But the case of *The Stockton and Darlington Railway Company v. Brown* (9 H. L. C. 246), showed that, when it was once proved that the purpose for which land was required was a purpose of the undertaking, the company, if they were acting *bona fide*, had power to take the land. Whatever a company was empowered to do was a purpose of their undertaking, and by section 68 the company was compelled to make good the interruption caused by the severance of a landowner's land. The case of *Earl Beauchamp v. The Great Western Railway Company* (16 W. R. 1155, L. R. 3 Ch. 745), was a distinct authority for the present case. There it was said by the plaintiff that some land, which the defendants had taken from him, had become superfluous land, and that they were bound to re-convey it to him. The defendants said that the land was not superfluous, because they wanted to use it to construct accommodation works for another landowner. And the case was decided against the plaintiff on the ground that the company could have taken his land in the first instance for the purpose of making the accommodation works, and that, therefore, having originally taken it for the purpose of making the embankment of their railway on it (which they had afterwards altered), they were entitled to keep the land for the purpose of the accommodation works. His lordship was of opinion that the company were entitled to take land for the purposes of any works which they were empowered to make, but in the present case it was sufficient to say that they could take land for the purpose of making works which they could be compelled to make. CORROON, L.J., said that the question was simply whether the land was *bona fide* required for the purposes of the company's undertaking. It was not necessary to show that the company could be compelled to make the works; it was enough to show that the land was reasonably required for the purpose of works which the company had power to make. The landowner whose land had been severed was not to be considered unless he was objecting to the mode in which the company proposed to restore the communication. The word "necessary" in section 68 meant necessary in the sense of restoring the communication in a convenient way, and it was left to the company's engineer to say what was a convenient way. Of course, if it was clear that the land which it was proposed to take could not be reasonably required for the purpose, the court would come to the conclusion that the engineer was not acting *bona fide*. The decision in *Pugh v. The Golden Valley Railway Company* (28 W. R. 44, 863, L. R. 12 Ch. D. 274, 15 Ch. D. 330), was quite consistent with this view. LINDLEY, L.J., said that the plaintiff's argument was that it was not necessary to take his land, because the communication for Davy might be made in another way. This was a suicidal argument, for, if there were six ways in which an accommodation work could be constructed, it might equally be said that each of them was not a necessary way. The only practical method was to allow a discretion to the company's engineer to decide in which way the work should be constructed, and all the authorities were in favour of this view. *Earl Beauchamp v. The Great Western Railway Company* was exactly in point.—SOLICITORS, Brookbank & Galland; Frankish & Buchanan.

PRACTICE—ADDING PARTIES FOR DISCOVERY—SOLICITOR—JUDICATURE ACT, 1873, s. 24, SUB-SECTION 3—ORD. 16, r. 13.—In a case of *Berry v. Keen*, before the Court of Appeal on the 15th inst., a question arose as to adding a party to an action merely for the purpose of obtaining discovery from

him. The action was brought by persons who, under the will of a testator, were entitled to real estate to recover possession of it from the defendants, who were in possession without any title. The defendants alleged that the legal estate was vested in some persons to whom the testator had conveyed it by way of mortgage. The plaintiffs interrogated the defendants, and asked them the names of the mortgagees. The defendants answered that they did not know the names of the mortgagees, but that their solicitors knew their names. The solicitors had acted for the testator in the preparation of the mortgages. The plaintiffs then took out a summons asking that they might be at liberty to add the solicitors as defendants to the action, and to interrogate them as to the names of the mortgagees, the object being then to make the mortgagees defendants. Hall, V.C., refused the application, and his decision was affirmed by the Court of Appeal (JESSEL, M.R., and COTTON, and LINDLEY, L.J.). Reliance was placed on section 24 (sub-section 3) of the Judicature Act, 1873, and on rule 13 of order 16, and also on the case of *Banner v. Jackson* (1 D. & Sm. 472), which, it was said, showed that before the Judicature Act the solicitors could have been made defendants for the purpose of discovery. JESSEL, M.R., said that a mere witness could not be made a party to an action, however essential the discovery which he could give might be to the plaintiff. In *Banner v. Jackson* the solicitor of the other defendant was properly made a defendant, because he had possession of certain documents which the other defendant claimed, and of which the plaintiff sought the delivery up. COTTON, L.J., said that in that case the solicitor had made himself an active party in the litigation. LINDLEY, L.J., said that the present application was, perhaps, an experiment worth trying, but it could not succeed.—SOLICITORS, *G. E. Carpenter; Brooke & Chapman.*

PRACTICE—DISCOVERY—INTERROGATORIES—ADMISSIONS—ORD. 31, R. 2.—In a case of *The Attorney-General v. Gaskill*, before the Court of Appeal on the 8th inst., the question was raised whether, under the present practice, interrogatories can be delivered by a plaintiff merely for the purpose of obtaining from the defendant an admission of right, or whether they ought to be restricted to the obtaining from the defendant information as to facts which are within his knowledge, and are not within the knowledge of the plaintiff. The action was brought by the Attorney-General, at the relation of a local board, to restrain the defendant from building (as it was alleged he was doing) so as to obstruct a footway which the plaintiffs alleged to be a public highway. The plaintiff delivered interrogatories for the examination of the defendant, and asked him (*inter alia*) whether the path in question was not a public highway, and whether it had not been for many years so used by the public. The defendant declined to answer this interrogatory, and Bacon, V.C., held that he was not bound to answer. It was urged on the defendant's behalf that the proper mode of making admissions is by the pleadings, which, under the present practice, are not put in upon oath, and that the discovery to be obtained by means of interrogatories is now limited to facts which the party interrogated knows, and which the interrogating party does not know. And reliance was placed on the decision of Bacon, V.C., in *Johns v. James* (L. R. 13 Ch. D. 370), in which the Vice-Chancellor disallowed an interrogatory delivered by a defendant to a plaintiff, asking whether certain allegations in the statement of claim were true or false. His lordship said that such an inquiry was like saying, "Have you not told a falsehood in your statement of claim?" and he thought that such an inquiry was not the province of interrogatories, and there was no reason why the plaintiff should be put to answer any such inquiry. JESSEL, M.R., said that the Vice-Chancellor appeared to have proceeded on some misapprehension as to the effect of the Judicature Act. The Judicature Act did not alter the old practice as to discovery, except so far as the rules expressly altered it. His lordship must not be supposed to be encouraging the practice of interrogating the defendant through all the statements contained in the statement of claim, as was the practice in the Court of Chancery before the Judicature Act. But rule 2 of order 31 provided a means of checking the delivery of unnecessary interrogatories, and his lordship hoped that a more effectual mode of checking this would soon be given. Here the defendant denied the existence of the alleged public right of way. The plaintiff asked him whether he did not know that there was this highway, and whether it had not been used by the public. The interrogatory was material. The objection to it was that it sought an admission on oath from the defendant of the whole matter in dispute. That was no objection at all. It was because the plaintiff had to prove his case that he sought to obtain an admission of his right from the defendant. If the plaintiff could get the admission, he would be relieved from the necessity of proving his case. To prove it would involve the calling of a great number of old witnesses, which would be a very expensive proceeding. One of the great objects of interrogatories had always been to save the expense of adducing evidence by getting admissions from the defendant, and not merely the discovery of facts which would lead to evidence. COTTON, L.J., said that the argument was that the old practice of the Court of Chancery as to discovery before the Judicature Act must be thrown aside now. This was a mistake. The Judicature Act enabled every party to interrogate his adversary, subject to certain checks, but the right to discovery remained the same as it was before. A party had a right to ask for admissions from his adversary of everything which was material to the issues raised on the pleadings. The object of the pleadings was to ascertain the issues between the parties; the object of interrogatories was to obtain admissions on oath which would relieve the interrogating party from the burden of proving his case by evidence. But his lordship would never encourage in any way the old practice of interrogating to every statement in the statement of claim, whether it was material or not. That practice was checked by rule 2 of order 31, and would probably hereafter be more effectually checked. LINDLEY, L.J., said that the Vice-Chancellor seemed to have forgotten that the rule under the Common Law Procedure Act, that it was necessary to obtain leave to deliver interrogatories, had been now abolished except

in the case of a company. No doubt the old chancery practice had been materially altered in this respect, that now the statement of defence and the interrogatories were different documents. It would be a great abuse to compel a man to admit on oath that which he had already admitted by his pleading, and for this reason the common law divisions had declined to allow interrogatories to be administered to a defendant until after he had delivered his defence. But, subject to this, the old practice of the Court of Chancery remained. A plaintiff was still entitled to discovery from the defendant, not only of facts within the defendant's knowledge, but to discovery in the wider sense of admissions of right. And in this case his lordship could see nothing oppressive or vexatious in asking the defendant whether he would admit on oath the existence of the alleged highway.—SOLICITORS, *Taylor, Hoare, & Taylor; F. Needham.*

RULES OF LONDON STOCK EXCHANGE—APPOINTMENT OF SETTLING DAY IN SHARES OF NEW COMPANY—FRAUD—RIGHTS OF JOBBERS—DEFAULTING MEMBER—ADMINISTRATION OF ASSETS BY OFFICIAL ASSIGNEE OF STOCK EXCHANGE—RIGHTS OF CREDITORS—DEBTOR'S SUMMONS—SECURITY—BANKRUPTCY ACT, 1869, s. 7—COPIES OF SHORTHAND WRITER'S NOTES OF EVIDENCE—COSTS.—In a case of *Ex parte Ward*, before the Court of Appeal on the 9th inst., some questions arose as to the construction of some of the rules of the London Stock Exchange. By the custom of the Stock Exchange all members are liable as principals upon the contracts into which they enter, even though they are, in fact, acting only as brokers for a principal. One rule provides that all contracts entered into with respect to the shares of a new company are contingent on the appointment of a special settling day by the committee. Another provision of the rules is that, when a member is declared a defaulter on the Stock Exchange, all his outstanding contracts are at once closed by the official assignee appointed under the rules, who receives all differences which are payable on that footing in respect of the winning contracts, and pays all differences which are due on the same footing in respect of the losing contracts. In *Ex parte Ward* a broker was commissioned by a client to buy for him some shares in a new company. The broker accordingly bought the shares from a jobber at a time when no settling day for the company's shares had been appointed. Both the jobber and the broker were members of the Stock Exchange. A settling day was afterwards appointed by the committee of the Stock Exchange. The application for a settling day was opposed, on the ground that there had been fraud in the getting up of the company, but the committee, after a long investigation, came to the conclusion that the allegations of fraud had not been proved. The client failed to provide the funds necessary to pay for the shares, and the broker was unable to do so, and, consequently, he was declared a defaulter on the Stock Exchange, and his contracts were closed by the official assignee in the ordinary way, but very little (if anything) was obtained in this way for distribution among the Stock Exchange creditors. The jobber afterwards, with the consent of the creditors of the broker (as required by another of the Stock Exchange rules), issued a debtor's summons against him for the amount due to him on his contracts to buy the shares. The broker applied to the court to dismiss the summons, alleging that no debt was due from him, mainly on the ground (1) that the appointment of the settling day had been obtained by fraud, and was, therefore, invalid; (2) that the jobber, having had the benefit of the distribution of assets by the Stock Exchange assignee, was precluded from taking any legal proceedings against the broker in respect of the same matter. Mr. Registrar Pepps overruled the objections, but, as the jobber did not object to the question of the validity of the debt being tried in an action, he ordered the proceedings on the summons to be stayed, pending the trial of an action, on the terms of the broker giving security for the amount claimed. The broker appealed, and it was urged that no security ought to have been required. The Court of Appeal (JESSEL, M.R., and COTTON and LINDLEY, L.J.) affirmed the decision. JESSEL, M.R., said that even if the settling day was obtained by fraud, that could not affect the rights of the jobber, unless it was shown that he was a party to the fraud, and of that there was not a particle of evidence. Even if such an extravagant notion could be entertained as that the committee were themselves parties to a fraud, that would not affect the rights of the jobber, if he was not a party to it. Then it was said that when a man was declared a defaulter on the Stock Exchange, the official assignee closed his accounts, and distributed what he received among the defaulter's creditors, and it was said that this had released the debt. Why it should, his lordship could not conceive. There was no such provision in the rules. To the extent, indeed, to which the debt had been paid in this way, it would be discharged, but no further. It was said that one of the rules provided that no legal proceedings should be taken by a member against a defaulter without the consent of his creditors. In this case, however, the creditors of the appellant had given their consent. But, if they had not, the rule did not destroy the debt. So far as his lordship was concerned, he could not see why the proceedings on the summons should have been stayed at all, even on the terms of security being given. But the respondent had consented to an order in that form. The law on this subject was quite settled by the two cases of *Ex parte Wood* (1 D. M. & G. 878), and *Ex parte Wier* (30 W. R. 457, L. R. 7 Ch. 319). In the latter case, Lord Justice James said, "The registrar ought to have had regard, not merely to Wier's solvency, but to the prospect of Tucker's success in an action." And Lord Justice Mellish said, "In determining whether security should be given, the registrar ought not only to consider the solvency of the alleged debtor, but also what is the probability that the claimant will be able to establish a debt. If the probability is that there is a good defence, security ought not to be required." Applying that rule to the present case, it was, in his lordship's opinion, tolerably clear that the appellant would have no defence to an action by the respondent for the alleged debt, and, therefore, the registrar was quite right in requiring security to be given. COTTON, L.J., and LINDLEY, L.J., both agreed that the fact that a settling day had been obtained by fraud would be wholly im-

material unless it could be shown that the jobber was an actor in or a party to the fraud, and of that there was no evidence.

The court allowed the respondents the costs of copies of a shorthand writer's notes of evidence taken before the registrar, on the ground that the respondents had been served by the appellant with notice that these notes would be read.—SOLICITORS, *L. Ravellins; Travers Smith, & Braithwaite*.

TAXATION OF COSTS—DELIVERY OF BILL OF COSTS TOGETHER WITH CASH ACCOUNT—RETENTION OF COSTS AND PAYMENT OF BALANCE—ATTORNEYS AND SOLICITORS ACT (6 & 7 VICT. C. 73), s. 41.—In the case of *In re Angore*, before Chitty, J., on the 10th inst., a motion was made by a solicitor to discharge an order for taxation. It appeared that the applicant, during the year 1879, and subsequently, had been engaged in transacting business for one Scowen. On the 30th of May, 1881, the solicitor delivered to Scowen his bill of costs, amounting to £100 9s. 7d., and on the day following a cash account, which showed a balance of £1 18s. 1d. to Scowen's credit after deducting the bill of costs. On the 24th of November, 1881, Scowen called at the solicitor's office, requesting payment of the balance due to him, and received from the solicitor a cheque for £1 16s. only. On the 23rd of February, 1882, Scowen took out a common order for taxation of the bill of costs delivered to him on the preceding 30th of May. The solicitor sought to discharge this order, on the ground that the receipt by Scowen of the balance was tantamount to payment of the bill. CHITTY, J., said that it was impossible, in the present case, to say that the solicitor had discharged the demands of his client in full, because it was apparent that the sum of 2s. 1d. was still unpaid. It must be held upon the facts that the client was entitled to the order asked for, since in point of law a payment of £1 16s. was not a payment of £1 18s. 1d. His lordship was also of opinion that if the solicitor had intended, by the payment actually made, to have finally settled all accounts between himself and his client, he should have drawn his client's attention to the matter at the time of payment, in order that an opportunity might be given to his client at once of taxing the bill of costs if he wished to do so. The motion must be refused, with costs.—SOLICITORS, *Angore; Emanuel & Simmonds*.

LANDLORD AND TENANT—DEMISE OF REALTY AND CHATTELS—DESTRUCTION BY FIRE—RENT.—In a case of *Marshall v. Schofield*, a case tried at the last Liverpool Assizes and heard on further consideration by Chitty, J., on the 14th inst., an important question arose as to the liability of certain lessees to pay rent under the following circumstances:—The plaintiffs, the trustees of a will, agreed to demise to the defendant "room and power" in a mill at an annual rent of £700, the landlords supplying steam power. The defendant entered under the agreement, occupied the premises for one year, and paid one year's rent. At the beginning of the second year the premises were burnt down. The agreement contained no clause providing for cesser of rent in case of the destruction of the premises. The plaintiffs claimed the whole second year's rent, less certain deductions, relying on the rule of law that if realty and personally are demised together the rent issues out of the realty only. The defendant, on the other hand, contended that the rent being indivisible, and the law not allowing apportionment, no rent whatever was payable. The landlord was unable to perform one side of the contract, and it was absurd to contend that the tenant was, nevertheless, bound to perform the other side. If the rule of law was to bear the interpretation claimed by the plaintiffs, the result would be that the landlord would be benefited by the destruction of his property. CHITTY, J., said that the rule of law was clear that rent issues out of the thing demised and every part of it. There had been endeavours long since to relieve the tenant upon the destruction of the tenement from the necessity of paying rent. But those endeavours had failed, and the established law was that the rent must be paid notwithstanding the disappearance of the property. The present case did not fall within that class of cases where there was a contract with covenants to be performed by either party. The result was that he must hold that the plaintiffs were entitled to the rent claimed, however harsh the law might seem to be, and however unfortunate the defendants—who had, probably, entered into the agreement in question without any legal assistance—might appear. It might be observed that it was usual in the case of properly drawn demises of land and effects—for instance, in the case of a demise of a house and furniture—to reserve two separate rents, and to insert a proviso of cesser of rent upon destruction by fire. His judgment must, therefore, be for the amount claimed.—SOLICITORS, *Bower & Cotton, for Jubb & Eooh, Halifax; H. Thompson, Liverpool*.

SOCIETIES.

SOLICITORS' BENEVOLENT ASSOCIATION.

The usual monthly meeting of the board of directors of this association was held at the Law Institution, Chancery-lane, London, on Wednesday, March 8, Mr. Philip Rickman, in the chair; the other directors present being Messrs. Asker (Norwich), Brook, Hedger, Hunter, Kays, Mellersh (Godalming), Paterson, Pennington, Roscoe, Rose, Smith, Walters, and Woolbert (Mr. E.W., secretary). A sum of £305 was distributed in grants of assistance among the necessitous families of thirteen deceased solicitors; five gentlemen were admitted members of the association; bequests of £100, in each case, announced under the wills of the late Henry Spence Fairfoot, Esq., and Charles Richard Craddock, Esq., solicitors; and other general business transacted.

EQUITY AND LAW LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY.

The annual general meeting of the shareholders was held on Tuesday, at the society's house, No. 18, Lincoln's-inn-fields, Mr. John M. Clabon presiding.

The secretary (Mr. S. W. Berridge) read the notice convening the meeting.

The report, which was taken as read, states that "During the past year, the 37th in the history of the society, 227 new policies have been issued, assuring £389,991; and of this amount £331,791 has been retained by the society, and the remainder re-assured. The gross amount of the new premiums is £12,791 9s. 11d., and the net amount, after deducting re-assurance premiums is £11,142 0s. 9d. The renewal premiums have amounted to £121,768 11s. 7d., and the amount of assurances, excluding re-assurances, in force at the end of the year was £4,340,169, the premiums on which amounted to £128,974 2s. 7d. The amount of interest and dividends received during the year was £59,738 14s. 1d., an amount rather smaller than that received in the previous year. This arises chiefly from the lowered rate of interest, and from our having had a large sum on deposit during the year. Three reversions have fallen into possession during the year, and one has been realized, which latter, with four allowed to be redeemed, have yielded a profit in all of £1,769 11s. 10d. Two small balances, amounting to £226 17s. 11d., have been written off. The claims have amounted to £99,805 9s. 3d., which is somewhat less than the expectation according to the tables by which the society's valuations are made. The amount of annuities paid during the year is £20,110 0s. 8d., whilst the amount received for the purchase of new annuities is only £10,565 6s. 11d.; the amount in force has decreased by £500 during the year. The total receipts during the year have amounted to £205,570 1s. 9d., and the total payments to £151,650 10s., so that the society's assets have been increased by £53,919 11s. 9d. They now amount to £1,724,603, and excluding the unproductive items, such as cash on current account and also the reversions, the remainder was invested on the 31st of December at an average rate of £4 10s. 6d. per cent. per annum. The directors who retire by rotation are the Hon. Mr. Justice Denman, Mr. Staveley Hill, Mr. Bristowe, and Mr. Horace Smith. Two of the auditors, Mr. Bailey and Mr. Pitcairn, also retire. All these gentlemen offer themselves for re-election.

The CHAIRMAN said—Gentlemen, it is now my duty to move the adoption of the report, and I am glad to tell you, as you have already seen, that I have again a prosperity speech to make to you. On looking over what I have said in past years, and what used to be said by our good friend, Mr. Russell, I find we are going over the same ground again and again, but while the figures are new, it must be interesting to all of us to know what the present actual state of the society is. I told you last year that we were well-to-do, because we had in the previous year sufficient new business, that we made a careful selection of our lives, and that we put out our money on good security. I think you will say, when I have finished my speech, that we can make the same assurance again this year. My friend on my left (Mr. Berridge), to whom we are so much indebted for the prosperity of the society, gives me some figures, and I shall read them to you, under various heads, to justify what I have said. The first I have will be the amount insured during the past year, which is £389,991. During the last five years the figures are these: I will give you the thousands and omit the hundreds. In 1876 the amount was £432,000; in 1877, £361,000; in 1878, £280,000; in 1879, £413,000; and in 1880, £366,000. The average of these is £379,160, so that you see we are more than the average for the last five years in the sum insured. If I take the premiums, I find the sum received for new premiums during the past year is £12,791. Then, taking the five years as before, in 1876 we received £15,197; in 1877, £13,000; in 1878, £8,600; in 1879, £13,000; and in 1880, £12,000. The average of this is £12,650, and the new premiums of last year being £12,791. Again, we are beyond the average of the last five years. I may tell you here that the average amount of our policies during the last year is £1718, and I need not tell you that the higher the amount, the probability is the higher the class of the life, and the higher the class of life, the life is so much the better. Therefore, when we have large policies you are pretty sure they are good lives. On the question of interest I shall have a little explanation to give, because those of you who have carefully analysed the account, will find that although our capital fund has been more, the interest received during the last year has been rather less. The first reason for that is simply that we cannot get the interest we used to get. Where we used to get 5 per cent. we now get $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., and where we got $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. we now get 4. We are glad to get good first-class securities even at 4 per cent., although we generally get a little more. We had a large amount during a considerable part of the year on deposit. We make investments from time to time as you see, but as we cannot get them to pay us more than £3 13s. per cent. you will readily suppose we are not anxious to go largely into securities of that class when we can get good mortgages to pay something like $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. Just now we have been waiting for a little time to get rid of a sum of £75,000 on good mortgage. Happily, lately we have got good interest, but there are times when money is wanting for a good mortgage, and the rate of interest being low the amount received of course suffers. From time to time reversions come in; they pay a higher rate than anything else—at least 6 per cent.—but they do not count in our interest. If we put out £30,000 during the year, possibly what we may get is £50,000 on reversions, but that does not count in the interest of the year. For these reasons, and in spite of all our care, the interest during the year does not come to quite so much as the interest of the preceding years. The claims again, though they seem of large amount, are one of our favourable items. They are just under £100,000, but they might have been, according to the calculations, £107,000; therefore we are under the mark, and that is another instance of the careful way in which we select our lives. Another item I should like to remark upon is that the

expenses of management are just four per cent. Taking the premium income and interest income you will find that is the amount, and if you look into our office you will see that although we have good clerks we have few of them. Now I come to the point with reference to the loans, and I will make an appeal to our brother shareholders that they should influence a little more certain business in the way of policies. I am going to divide the loans into two classes, and first I will divide them in this way. The total amount of new business of 1881 is £389,991. Although the directors have brought us £42,000 the shareholders, I am sorry to say, have only brought £9,000, so I hope the shareholders in future will do a little more. Solicitors, not shareholders, have brought us £88,000, the officers have brought £22,000, and I think they have done their duty fairly well. Other offices, from whom, of course, we get a good deal and give a good deal of business, have brought us £91,000, and from other sources, public and general, we have had £35,000. I will divide the amount in another way into policies with loans and policies without loans, and we find the policies with loans are £121,000, while the policies without loans are £268,000. Thus the loans bring us a large amount of business, and inasmuch as Mr. Berridge tells me for the purposes of this calculation you must exclude the business coming from other offices, the result is that nearly one-half of our business is in connection with loans. A good life interest in a good estate with a policy connected with it is the best business we can have. We have hitherto done this at the rate of five per cent., and probably when money gets tighter again we shall be able to command that amount. I may mention in connection with this that the utmost care is given to our securities. There is a standing committee, and once a year every security is gone through in the most careful way. We have books in which full particulars are entered, and I do not think it is possible to have a more careful lending of our money on securities, or of taking more care in their selections than we do. Another matter, and that is entirely a new one. We have had a new prospectus prepared during the last year, and those of you who have simply looked at the outside will not, I hope, fail to look in the inside. The number of tables has considerably increased. We have varied the manner in which we offer terms to the public, and have introduced one on which my mind has been for some time running. In the Law Life—in which I was insured before I became a shareholder in this office—when a bonus is declared, it is added to the policy, the premium is reduced, and that reduction goes through the whole of the life. When the next term comes with a bonus and a reduction, it operates on the reduction—and so on. But with us hitherto, at the end of the five years—when the reduction has taken place—the premium goes on to its own old level again, to be reduced probably by the profit of the next five years; but I much prefer a permanent premium reduction. We have now a table by which those who choose to take the profit in this way will have the option of doing so. Mr. Berridge, who has to be our inspiration in such matters, tells us that our policies without profits were rather too near our policies with profits; in other words, people were prevented from taking these because they seemed so near the policies without profits. We have reduced them slightly, and have now a rate of premiums without profits, which we think are fairer and better ones. If you look into the prospectus you will find other tables have been added, and on the whole I believe there is no other office which gives so great a variety of modes of insuring life as we now do. I have said already something about the staff. You will remember that on a former occasion one of you said we ought to pay our staff well. Every five years at least we have a complete revision of the whole staff, and we endeavour to do our duty by them; and whenever the time comes for our giving a further increase which they deserve, you may depend on it it will not be forgotten by the directors. There are few places in London which can compare with ours. Having made these few observations, I again repeat that I believe our figures can prove all that I have said, and I would move the adoption of the report.

Mr. BRISTOWE.—I have great pleasure in seconding the adoption of the report, and after the full statement made by our chairman I think there is little I need add.

The resolution, after some discussion, was then put and carried unanimously.

Mr. EILOART proposed the re-election of the retiring directors, the Hon. Mr. Justice Denman, Mr. Staveley Hill, Mr. Bristowe, and Mr. Horace Smith.

Mr. BOODLE seconded the resolution which was carried.

Mr. LEMON proposed the re-election of the retiring auditors, Mr. Bailey and Mr. Pitcairn, which was duly seconded and carried.

Mr. J. H. JAMES proposed that the thanks of the meeting be presented to the directors, and that the sum of £2,500, free of income tax, be voted to them for their services during the past year.

The resolution was seconded and carried.

The CHAIRMAN replied and said he had a pleasing duty to perform; he had already said what he thought of the staff; of Mr. Berridge it was impossible to speak too highly, and the board had the utmost confidence in him. They had also an excellent staff. He had, therefore, much pleasure in proposing a vote of thanks to Mr. Berridge and the staff for their services during the past year.

The resolution was seconded and cordially received.

Mr. BERRIDGE.—I beg to thank you for the kindness with which you have passed this resolution. It is now some years since we met with some little criticism, but it has always been friendly, and on behalf of myself and the staff I beg to thank you.

The meeting then separated.

LAW STUDENTS' JOURNAL.

INCORPORATED LAW SOCIETY.

PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION.

The following candidates were successful at the Preliminary Examination held on the 15th and 16th of February, 1882:—

Adams, William	Harper, Thomas Bishop
Aizlewood, Albert Percy	Harris, Herbert Henry
Allen, Francis	Haslam, Thomas Penman
Allen, Reginald Lloyd	Hatton, William
Armstrong, Henry Tudor	Havelock, George Eric
Ashton, Ernest	Havinden, Henry James
Ashton, Henry Buxton Angier	Heath, Alfred Thomas
Astley, Henry D'Oyley Wolvey	Henry, James Jocelyn Coghill
Badenoch, George	Herrtage, Alfred Robert
Baines, Sidney Herbert	Hewett, John Arthur Binford
Baker, Joseph John Voshon	Heywood, George William
Barber, Frederick Wayne	Hindle, William Henry
Barrat, William Percy	Hine, John
Barton, Claude Edward	Hogg, John Powell
Bate, Charles John Copeland	Holden, Charles James
Beale, Harry Hibberd	Holmes, Frank Henry
Beaumont, Henry	Holt, William Edward
Beasley, Ernest Wallace	Howard, John
Birkett, George Thomas	Howell, Stephen Nayler
Blake, Alfred James	Hudson, Albert Edward Rose
Blockside, William Henry	Hudson, Harry
Bloomer, William	Hughes, Alfred Colingwood
Bockett, John Bradney	Irons, William
Boyce, Godfrey Hale	Jackman, James Croome
Boyle, Ernest Patrick Charles	Jacobs, Lewis David Henriques
Bradbury, Benjamin Hall	James, Thomas William
Bridge, Henry Sansum	Jarratt, William Osley
Brown, Frederick	Jekyll, Arthur Joseph
Brown, Henry Harold	Jenkins, Robert Owen
Browne, Edward Thomas	Jenkyn, Thomas Edward
Brυνee, Robert Nathaniel	Judd, William Hubert
Burn, Roddam William	Kent, James George
Byron, Christopher	Kinder, Alexander Horace
Calvert, Thomas Land	King, Gerald
Campion, Harold Gilmore	Kinsey, Pryce Owen
Chapman, Frederick William	Kough, Edward Ernest
Churcher, Walter	Laycock, John Benjamin
Clarke, James	Lear, Arthur James
Clarke, John Bagram	Liddle, Mark Anthony
Clarke, Thomas	Lightfoot, Ernest William
Clifton, Harvey	Lister, Edwin
Clinton, William James	Lister, Thomas Henry
Cobb, Preston	Locke, Frederick Robert
Cobb, Reginald Julius	Lord, Arthur Edward
Cohen, David	Macknay, Alexander Joseph
Cole, Ralph Neville	Magoris, Henry
Corlett, William Ernest	Marriott, Frederick
Cornish, John Batten	Matthews, Robert Edwin Ernest
Coulson, Harry	Middlemas, William
Cox, George	Middleton, Frederic Sholto
Cozens, Leonard John	Miller, James Percival
Daniel, John James Campbell	Milward, Edward Bickerton
Davies, Charles Frederick	Milward, Victor Graham
Davies, Morris Robert	Morgan, William Arthur
Dawson, Albert Edward	Mundell, Thomas Hodgson
Day, Francis Meredith	Munro, Granville Deives May
Dodds, Charles Acton	Newby, John William
Drake, Charles Rivers	Nightingale, Frederick James
Dunkerly, Charles William	Ochse, Albert
Dunn, Albert Edward	Ochse, Oscar
Dunn, Cecil William	Ogden, Francis
Durant, Edward Cecil	Palmer, Hubert
Earle, Francis George	Parkyn, Alfred Howard
Eddowes, Chas. Randolph B.	Paterson, William Hockin
Edell, John Frederick	Payn, Arthur Stransom
Edwards, George William	Peat, Charles Augustus
Elger, Thomas John Henry	Pearce, Ernest Johnson
Ellis, Edgar Macknay	Pearce, James Alfred
Elmsall, Mansfield de Cardonnel	Phillips, George Ingleton
Fardell, John	Pickering, Arthur Reginald
Farman, Harold Augustus	Pierce, Henry Herbert
Flower, Ernest Francis Swan	Pierce, John Hamilton
Foster, Theodore	Pillers, Ernest James
Fowden, John	Pilling, Charles Ernest
Fowler, Archibald Robert	Plant, Norman
French, John William	Piows, Robert Cunningham
Fry, Conrad P.	Plowman, Arthur Clement
Fullalove, William Thomas	Porter, Charles
Gardiner, George Charles	Ramsden, Walter
Germion, Richard Medland Banfill	Rhodes, Abraham Robert Wint
Glover, Roger Richard	Richards, Frank Peet
Griffith, Robert Herbert	Ridley, Henry Douglas
Guscombe, Leonard John	Ridsdale, John
Hall, Robert Michael	Rigden, William Attwood

Roberts, Charles Watkin
 Roberts, William Brereton Page
 Robertson, Edgar Macdonald
 Robertson, Reginald
 Robinson, Frederick Winder
 Robinson, John
 Rockliff, George
 Rockstro, Arthur
 Rowlands, John William
 Russell, John Speke
 Sear, Merton Lane
 Sergeant, Bernard Gilpin
 Shacklock, William George
 Sherratt, Walter
 Silcock, Frederick Woods
 Simpson, Francis Walter
 Simpson, Harold
 Smallman, Henry Francis John
 Smith, Henry John
 Smith, Reginald Ernest
 Smith, Thomas Henry
 Sparrow, Henry Thomas
 Stabler, James William
 Stansfeld, Francis William
 Stanley, Frederick Henry
 Stephens, John
 Sutton, Joseph Harry
 Talbot, William Towers
 Taylor, Charles Alfred Innes
 Taylor, Samuel White
 Terry, John Percival
 Thompson, Edward Mackenzie
 Thompson, John Lord

Thorn, Alfred Henry
 Tickle, Albert Edward
 Todd, Thomas Burland
 Tappin, John Herbert
 Turner, George Holborn
 Turner, Richard John
 Verley, Frank Louis
 Vero, Harry
 Vise, Ambrose Edward
 Voysey, Herbert Annesley
 Walker, Frederic Lake
 Walker, John Leonard
 Walker, William
 Ward, William
 Watson, William
 Webb, Edward Hunter
 Welch, Winthrop Goodwin
 West, Walter Sellers
 Weston, George Augustus
 Whately, Thomas Percival
 Widdop, John
 Widdowson, William Joseph
 Wilford, John Charles
 Wilkinson, William T.
 Williams, Ernest Goodrich
 Williams, Walter Charles
 Williamson, Walter
 Wood, Arthur Herbert
 Wright, Albert
 Wright, Edgar Trafford
 Wyatt, Algernon Hugh
 Yarde, John Edward Whidborne
 Yewdall, Charles Edward

LAW STUDENTS' DEBATING SOCIETY.

Tuesday, February 28.—Mr. Bilney in the chair.—The subject for debate was, "Ought capital punishment to be abolished?" The discussion was opened by Mr. C. Bramley in the affirmative, and he was supported by Messrs. Etherington, H. Mossop, T. Stevens, Bartlett, and Napier. The negative side of the question was supported by Messrs. A. Austin, Barker, Richardson, Hurst, Lloyd Jones, and Pope. The opener having replied, the question was put to the meeting, and decided in the negative by twenty-two votes to five. There were thirty-five members present.

March 7.—Mr. Kirk in the chair.—Mr. Bilney was elected reporter in the place of Mr. Spiers, who has been elected to the office of secretary. The whole of the evening was employed in discussing business of the society. There were thirty-nine members present. The subject appointed for discussion next Tuesday, the 14th inst., is "That women possessing the necessary property qualification in their own right ought to be admitted to the parliamentary franchise." Mr. J. A. Neale is appointed to open the debate.

Tuesday, March 14.—Mr. Kirk in the chair.—Messrs. William Austin, George Augustus Chichester May, and Joseph Sykes were duly elected members of the society. The subject appointed for discussion was: "That women possessing the necessary property qualification in their own right ought to be admitted to the parliamentary franchise." The debate was opened by Mr. J. A. Neale in the affirmative, and, in the discussion which followed, he was supported by Messrs. R. Mossop, Sergeant, Lloyd Jones, C. E. Barry, and Trotter. Messrs. Davies, Behan, J. Van Sommer, Strickland, G. B. Ellis, and Graham spoke in favour of the negative. The opener having replied, a division took place which resulted in the question being negatived by a majority of four. Thirty members were present.

UNITED LAW STUDENTS' SOCIETY.

At a meeting held at Clement's-inn Hall, on Wednesday, February 22, Mr. B. T. Bartrum in the chair, the Conveyancing Act, 1881, formed the subject under discussion for the evening, which was opened in a very able manner by Mr. Rubenstein, who, in the course of his speech, drew attention to some of the more prominent features of the Act. He thought the Act was eminently calculated to fulfil the object for which it was intended, and that it would be accepted by the profession, and universally adopted. The following gentlemen also spoke upon the subject:—Messrs. Jenks, Richardson, Ashton Cross, Tillotson, Clarkson, and Paice. Mr. Rubenstein replied, dealing with the arguments which had been brought forward in the course of the discussion in detail. The chairman then put before the house the following motion:—"That the Conveyancing Act, 1881, will be of material benefit to the public and the profession," which was carried *nem. con.* A vote of thanks to Mr. Rubenstein was proposed by Mr. Shirley Shirley and seconded by Mr. Richardson. The total number of gentlemen present was forty-two.

At a meeting held at Clement's-inn Hall on Wednesday, March 8, Mr. B. T. Bartrum in the chair, Mr. Rosher moved, "That the Government ought not to allow the Channel Tunnel to be made." The hon. opener was supported by Messrs. Hutton, Shirley-Shirley, Parsons, and Blackwell, and opposed by Messrs. Spence, Bartrum, Bull, and Richardson. Mr. Rosher having replied, the chairman (Mr. Broun, in the absence of Mr. Bartrum) summed up, and the motion, having been put to the meeting, was declared carried by a majority of two votes.

At a meeting held at the Law Institution, Chancery-lane, on Monday, March 13, Mr. D'A. B. Collyer in the chair, Mr. Shirley opened the following

motion in the negative:—"A. administers a deadly poison to B., intending to injure C. in B.'s estimation by making B. think that the poison was administered by C. B. is killed. Was A. rightly convicted of manslaughter?" The opener was followed by Messrs. Crundwell, Rundle Levey, and Parsons, who supported the negative view of the question, although upon different grounds. The affirmative was maintained by Mr. Lawson. The chairman summed up, and upon the question being put to the meeting it was carried in the negative *nem. con.*

At the usual weekly meeting held at Clement's-inn Hall, on Wednesday, March 15, Mr. A. D. MacLaren in the chair, Mr. Keins-Jackson moved, "That the belief that ghosts are seen objectively is sound." He was supported by Messrs. Rundle Levey, Bull, and Cook, and opposed by Messrs. Edlin, Dawbaro, and Davies. The opener having replied, the chairman summed up, and, upon a division, the motion was declared carried by one vote.

BIRMINGHAM LAW STUDENTS' SOCIETY.

The Birmingham law students held their usual fortnightly debate in the Law Library, Bennett's-hill, on Tuesday, February 28, twenty-five members being present. The chair was taken by J. Moore Bailey, Esq. The subject for the evening was, "In a contract for the hire of a specific chattel, is there any implied warranty as to its quality or condition?" The case chiefly relied upon was that of *Robertson v. The Amazon Tug and Lighterage Company*, decided in the Court of Appeal in August last year. The speakers for the affirmative were Messrs. Cochrane, Clarke, and Ryland; and for the negative, Messrs. A. L. J. Brown and Restall. The debate was decided in favour of the negative by a majority of five. A vote of thanks to the chairman concluded the meeting.

MANCHESTER LAW STUDENTS' SOCIETY.

The ninth meeting of the session of this society was held on Tuesday evening, the 28th of February, at the Law Library, Cross-street, the chair being taken by Mr. J. K. Bradbury, barrister-at-law. The question for discussion was as follows:—"For a loan of £100, a money-lender's charge was £20 if the bill of sale was to be registered, and £10 if it was not. A borrower agreed to pay the £40, and the money-lender promised not to register, and a bill of sale was thereupon given for £140, the consideration stated being a present advance of £100. Is the consideration truly stated?" The affirmative was opened by Mr. Gartside, and he was supported by Messrs. Humphreys, Hargreaves, Peacock, Kayner, the hon. secretary, and Mr. Solly. For the negative there spoke Messrs. Howarth, Shaw, Wilson, and Hardman. The chairman summed up the arguments, and on the voting being taken, the question was decided in the negative by a majority of fourteen. Members present, 29.

The tenth meeting of the session of this society was held on Tuesday evening, the 14th inst., at the Law Library, Cross-street, the chair being taken by Mr. J. M. Yates, barrister-at-law. The question for discussion was as follows:—"A. sells B. 3,000 tons of coal at 10s. per ton, to be delivered in November, or equally over November, December, and January, at 6d. per ton extra. A. offers delivery of the whole in November, but B. fails to accept any portion then, but claims delivery of 1,000 tons in December and 1,000 tons in January. Is he entitled to delivery?" The affirmative was opened by Mr. Rayner, and he was supported by Messrs. C. R. Hardman and Rycroft. For the negative there spoke Messrs. Knight, Ogden, Clarke, Wilson, Coward, and Birch. The chairman summed up the arguments, and, on the voting being taken, the question was decided in the negative by a majority of sixteen. Members present, 38.

LEGAL APPOINTMENTS.

Mr. RICHARD GREEN MARSDEN, solicitor, of 20, Old Cavendish-street, Cavendish-square, W., and 15, Addison-gardens, Kensington, has been appointed a Perpetual Commissioner for taking the Acknowledgments of Deeds by Married Women in and for the County of Middlesex and the Cities of London and Westminster.

Mr. JOHN GEORGE WILSON, solicitor, of 60, Saddler-street, Durham, has been appointed by Mr. Robert Anthony Burrell, of Fairthorne, near Botley, Hampshire, high sheriff of the county of Durham, as his Under-Sheriff.

Mr. EDWARD WILLIAM WORLEDGE, solicitor, of Great Yarmouth, has been appointed a Commissioner to administer Oaths in the Supreme Court of Judicature.

Mr. WILLIAM HENRY TINSLEY, solicitor, of Dudley and Sedgley, has been appointed a Commissioner to administer Oaths in the Supreme Court of Judicature.

Mr. CHARLES FORD, solicitor, of 10, Howard-street, and Portsmouth, has been appointed a Perpetual Commissioner for taking the Acknowledgments of Deeds by Married Women for the Counties of Middlesex, Surrey, and Hampshire, and the Cities of London and Westminster.

Mr. MORRIS OWEN, solicitor, of Carnarvon, has been appointed a Notary Public for Carnarvon and district.

Mr. EDWARD LEADBITTER, solicitor (of the firm of Leadbitter, Harvey, & Bigge), of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, has been appointed, by the Duke of Northumberland, to be Steward of the Manor of Tynemouth. Mr. Leadbitter was admitted a solicitor in 1860.

Mr. THOMAS HENRY HEWITT, solicitor (of the firm of Hewitt & Alexander),

of 27, Ely-lane, has been appointed Clerk to the Commissioners of Income Tax for the City of London. Mr. Hewitt has been for several years solicitor to the commissioners. He was admitted in 1860.

Mr. HENRY EDWIN KISBEY, solicitor, of 105, Cheapside, has been appointed Solicitor to the Tramway and Omnibus Employers' Association. Mr. Kisbey was admitted a solicitor in 1876.

Mr. JOHN HILL MUNDAY, solicitor (of the firm of Ellis & Munday), of 19, St. Swithin's-lane, has been appointed a Perpetual Commissioner for taking the Acknowledgments of Deeds by Married Women for the Counties of Middlesex and Surrey and the Cities of London and Westminster.

Mr. JAMES CHAPMAN, solicitor, of Gresham-buildings, Basinghall-street, and of Flumstead, has been appointed a Commissioner to administer Oaths in the Supreme Court of Judicature.

Mr. SYDNEY GATER WARNER, solicitor, of 6, Quality-court, Chancery-lane, has been appointed a Commissioner to administer Oaths in the Supreme Court of Judicature.

Mr. RICHARD WILLIAM GILLESPIE, solicitor (of the firm of Wilkinson & Gillespie), of Walsall, has been appointed a Perpetual Commissioner for Staffordshire for taking the Acknowledgments of Deeds by Married Women.

Mr. WILLIAM MORGAN, solicitor, of Birmingham, has been appointed Honorary Solicitor to the Birmingham Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. Mr. Morgan was admitted a solicitor in 1836.

Mr. BERNARD WAKE, solicitor, of Sheffield, has been elected President of the Sheffield Law Society for the ensuing year. Mr. Wake was admitted a solicitor in 1845.

Mr. WILLIAM ASCROFT, solicitor, of Preston, has been appointed a Magistrate for that borough. Mr. Ascroft was admitted a solicitor in 1855.

Mr. THOMAS PRIESTMAN, solicitor, of Hull, has been appointed Solicitor to the Hull School Board, in succession to Mr. Briggs Carill, resigned. Mr. Priestman was admitted a solicitor in 1868.

Mr. WILLIAM BREWIS ELSDON, solicitor (of the firm of Brewis, Elsdon, & Dransfield), of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, has been appointed Deputy Coroner for the Southern Division of the county of Northumberland. Mr. Elsdon was admitted a solicitor in 1869.

Mr. JOHN GEORGE WILSON, solicitor (of the firm of Wilson & Langley), of Durham, has been appointed by the high sheriff of Durham (Mr. Robert Anthony Burrell) to be Under-Sheriff of that county for the ensuing year. Mr. Wilson is an M.A. of Worcester College, Oxford. He was admitted a solicitor in 1876, and he is also clerk to the Brandon Local Board.

Mr. ALEXANDER MILNE, solicitor, of Kendal, has been appointed by the high sheriff of Westmorland (Mr. William Thompson) to be Under-Sheriff of that county for the ensuing year. Mr. Milne was admitted a solicitor in 1877.

Mr. EDWARD HOLME WOODCOCK, solicitor (of the firm of Part, Woodcock, Walmsley, & Hope), of Wigan, Southport, and Atherton, has been appointed by the high sheriff of Lancashire (Mr. George McCorquodale) to be Under-Sheriff of that county for the ensuing year. Mr. Woodcock was admitted a solicitor in 1868. He is clerk to the county magistrates at Wigan, and registrar of the Wigan County Court.

Mr. JOHN STUCK BARNES, solicitor, of Colchester, has been appointed by the high sheriff of Essex (Mr. Hector John Gordon Rebow) to be Under-Sheriff of that county for the ensuing year. Mr. Barnes was admitted a solicitor in 1834. He is clerk of the peace for Colchester, and registrar to the Colchester County Court.

Mr. EDWARD MORGAN UNDERWOOD (of the firm of Knight & Underwood), of Hereford, has been appointed by the high sheriff of Herefordshire (Mr. Theophilus Wm. Lane) to be Under-Sheriff of that county for the ensuing year. Mr. Underwood was admitted a solicitor in 1862.

Mr. BRISCOE HOOPER, solicitor and notary (of the firm of Hooper & Wollen), of Torquay, has been appointed by the high sheriff of Devonshire (Mr. William Halliday) to be Under-Sheriff of that county for the ensuing year. Mr. Hooper was admitted a solicitor in 1851.

Mr. ALPHEUS HENRY ROBOTHAM, solicitor, of Derby, has been appointed by the high sheriff of Derbyshire (Mr. Charles Edward Newton) to be Under-Sheriff of that county for the ensuing year. Mr. Robotham was admitted a solicitor in 1857.

Mr. NANABHAI HARIDAS, Government Pleader at Bombay, has been appointed to act as a Judge of the High Court of Judicature at Bombay.

Mr. JOSEPH WILKINSON, solicitor (of the firm of Leeman, Wilkinson, & Leeman), of York, has been appointed Deputy Clerk of the Peace for the East Riding of Yorkshire. Mr. Wilkinson was admitted a solicitor in 1848. He is in partnership with Mr. Joseph Johnson Leeman, M.P. for York, and with Mr. Frank Leeman, and he is also town clerk and clerk of the peace for the city of York.

Mr. HENRY S. COLDICOTT, solicitor (of the firm of Coldicott & Son), of Dudley, has been appointed a Commissioner to administer Oaths in the Supreme Court of Judicature. Mr. Coldicott was admitted in 1875.

Mr. JOHN TALIESIN DAVIES, solicitor, of Neath, has been appointed a Perpetual Commissioner for taking Acknowledgments of Married Women in and for the counties of Brecknock and Glamorgan. Mr. Davies was admitted in 1870.

COMPANIES.

WINDING-UP NOTICES.

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

ENGLISH MOUNT MANUFACTURING COMPANY, LIMITED.—Chitty, J. has fixed Monday, Mar 20, at 11, at his chambers, for the appointment of an official liquidator.

LA CONCEPCION GOLD MINING COMPANY, LIMITED.—Kay, J. has, by an order dated Feb 4, appointed Thomas Stephen Evans, 5 and 6, Bucklersbury, to be official liquidator.

LAMBERT GRAY & CO. LIMITED.—Kay, J. has, by an order dated Jan 23, appointed James Waddell, 1, Queen Victoria st., to be official liquidator.

WITHERSEA PIER, PROMENADE, GAS, AND GENERAL IMPROVEMENT COMPANY, LIMITED.—By an order made by Hall, V.C., dated Mar 2, it was ordered that the voluntary winding up of the company be continued, but subject to the supervision of the court.

Bell and Co, Bow churchyard, agents for Woodhouse, Kingston upon Hull, solicitor for the petitioner.

[Gazette, Mar. 10.]

ENGLISH AND FRENCH BANK, LIMITED.—By an order made by Hall, V.C., dated Mar 3, it was ordered that the bank be wound up; and that Norman Tronson, the provisional official liquidator, be continued until the appointment of an official liquidator of the company. Davis and Co, Coleman st., solicitors for the petitioner.

NEW PENROSE TIN AND COPPER MINE COMPANY, LIMITED.—Petition for winding up, presented Mar 13, directed to be heard before Hall, V.C., on Mar 21. Campbell and Co, Warwick st, Regent st, solicitors for the petitioner.

[Gazette, Mar. 14.]

UNLIMITED IN CHANCERY.

ROMFORD CANAL COMPANY.—Hall, V.C., has fixed Friday, Mar 24, at 12, at his chambers, for the appointment of an official liquidator.

[Gazette, Mar. 14.]

COUNTY PALATINE OF LANCASTER.

UNLIMITED IN CHANCERY.

BOROUGH PERMANENT BENEFIT BUILDING SOCIETY.—Petition for winding up, presented Mar 7, directed to be heard before Bristowe, V.C., at 11, Old sq, Lincoln's inn, on Mar 20. W. and A. Ascroft, Preston, solicitors for the petitioner.

[Gazette, Mar. 10.]

STANNARIES OF CORNWALL.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

LORD KIMBERLEY MINE EXPLORATION COMPANY, LIMITED.—By an order made by the Vice-Warden, dated Mar 9, it was ordered that the company be wound up. Hodges and Co, Truro, agents for Paige and Co, Redruth, solicitors for the petitioner.

[Gazette, Mar. 14.]

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES DISSOLVED.

DENBIGH UNION SOCIETY, Cross Keys Inn, Denbigh. Mar 7.

KYO AND ANNFIELD PLAIN PROVIDENT SOCIETY, Kyo, nr Annfield Plain, Durham.

Mar 8.

[Gazette, Mar. 10.]

WIDOW AND ORPHAN INSTITUTION OR AUXILIARY FUND OF THE NATIONAL INDEPENDENT ORDER OF ODDFELLOWS (Birmingham District), Red Lion Inn, Smallbrook st, Birmingham. Mar 10.

[Gazette, Mar. 14.]

LEGISLATION OF THE WEEK.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

March 9.—*Bills Read a Second Time.*

Brimstone Saltings Reclamation; Consolidated Fund (No. 1).

Bill Read a Third Time.

Postcards (Reply).

March 10.—*Bill Read a Second Time.*

Slate Mines (Gunpowder).

Bill Read a Third Time.

Consolidated Fund (No. 1).

March 13.—*Royal Assent.*

The Royal Assent was given by Commission to the Consolidated Fund (No. 1) Bill, and to the Postcards (Reply) Bill.

March 14.—*Bills in Committee.*

Settled Land; Conveyancing (both passed through Committee).
Slate Mines (passed through Committee).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Bills Read a Second Time.

PRIVATE BILLS.—Easton Neston Mineral; Towcester, Roade, and Olney Junction Railway; Mersey Railway.

Bill in Committee.

Boiler Explosions (passed through Committee).

New Bill.

Bill to declare and enact the law as to the rights of parishioners in respect of their parish churches (Mr. A. GRAY).

March 10.—*Bills Read a Second Time.*

PRIVATE BILLS.—North London Suburban Tramway; London and South-Western Spring Water; London Southern Tramways; Metropolitan Commons Supplemental; Metropolis Management, Building, and Floods Prevention Acts (Amendment).

New Bill.

Bill to amend the laws relating to turnpike roads in South Wales (Mr. DODSON).

March 13.—*Bills Read a Second Time.*

PRIVATE BILLS.—Bromsgrove Gas; Cranbrook and Paddock-wood Railway (Extension to Hawkhurst); Great Western Railway (No. 2); Northwich Gas;

South Eastern Railway (Various Powers); Welshpool and Llanfair R-rilway (Abandonment); Wimbledon, Merton, and West Metropolitan Junction Railway.

March 14.—Bills Read a Second Time.

PRIVATE BILLS.—Newcastle-upon-Tyne Improvement; Oxford Gas; Sutton and London and South-Western Junction Railway; Tilbury and Gravesend Tunnel Junction Railway; Worcester and Broom Railway.

March 15.—Bills Read a Second Time.

PRIVATE BILL.—Newhaven Harbour.
Judgments (Inferior Courts).

New Bills.

Bill to amend the law relating to patents (Sir J. LUBBOCK); Bill to alter the incidence of the expenses of School Boards and the period for the election of School Boards (Mr. REGINALD YORKE).

CREDITORS' CLAIMS.

CREDITORS UNDER ESTATES IN CHANCERY. LAST DAY OF PROOF.

CULLUM, WILLIAM, Camberwell rd, Builder. Mar 27. Guyatt v Cullum, Fry, J. Easton, Walworth rd.
DEAN, SAMUEL, Chester, Saddler. April 3. Dean v Wright, Hall, V.C. Bridgman and Co, Chester.
DELAHOYE, RICHARD, Aberystwith, Cardigan. Mar 25. Davies v Delahoyde, Hall, V.C. Hughes, Aberystwith.
MARSHALL, THOMAS ALEXANDER, Parkhurst rd, Holloway, Gent. Mar 25. Marshall v Maclear, Fry, J. Hopwood, Chancery lane.
ORWIN, WILLIAM, New Whittington, near Chesterfield, Grocer. Mar 24. Goundry v Orwin, Bacon, V.C. Bunting, Chesterfield.
PRICE, WILLIAM, and HENRY PRICE, Drovers' Arms Inn, Bulth, Brecon. Mar 25. Price v Price, Fry, J. Price, Bulth.
PRYER, GEORGE, Old Broad st, Naval Architect. Mar 31. Pryer v Pryer, Hall, V.C. Wittey, Colchester.
RIMELL, Rev Edgcombe, Plymouth. April 10. Rimell v Rimell, Hall, V.C. Gidley, Plymouth.
SAUNDERS, GEORGE, Wallingford, Berks, Auctioneer. Mar 24. Sevell v Fastnedge, Chitty, J. Field, Reading.

[Gazette, Feb. 28.]

DAVIDGE, ROBERT, Hants, Farm Bailiff. April 8. Arnold v Arnold, Hall, V.C. Moore, Lymington.
HORSFORD, FREDERICK, Rotherham, York, Furnace Builder. April 17. Horsford v Horsford, Hall, V.C. Bell, Sheffield.
HUDSON, GEORGE, Sherwood, Greenwich, Gent. May 4. Hudson v Hudson, Hall, V.C. Hine-Haycock and Bridgman, Colliers hill.
HUGHES, HENRY NELSON, Rhosddu, Wrexham, Builder. Mar 31. Griffiths v Griffiths, Fry, J. Poyser, Wrexham.
LEWIS, WALTER, Blaenavon, Monmouth, Relieving Officer. April 14. Ody v Harris, Chitty, J. Browne, Abergavenny.
MCLEEN, SAMUEL, Camden st, Islington green. Mar 20. McLeen v Pycke, Bacon, V.C. Lickorish, Queen Victoria st.
NORRIS, ARTHUR STRELLING, Little Gaddesden, Hertford, Farmer. Mar 25. Bunker v Rodwell, Bacon, V.C. Grover, Hemel Hempstead.
READ, JOHN, Woodlands, Isleworth, Gent. Mar 31. Galloway v Harris, Chitty, J. Briggs, Isleworth.
REDGROVE, GEORGE, Long Acre, Licensed Victualler. April 15. Redgrove v Redgrove, Fry, J. King, Martin's lane, Cannon st.
REED, WILLIAM, Mallison rd, Clapham. Mar 24. Reed v Hobson, Bacon, V.C. Ballard, Clifford's inn, Fleet st.
SHELDON, EDWARD PATTERSON, Carlisle, Ironfounder. April 1. Nixon v Sheldon, Fry, J. Hough, Carlisle.
WARD, WILLIAM, The Lawn, Brixton hill, Esq. Mar 31. Ward v Kennedy, Chitty, J. Neal, Old Jewry.
WILLIAMS, Rev ROBERT, Rhydyroseau, Salop. Mar 23. Williams v Williams, Bacon, V.C. Longueville and Co, Oswestry.

[Gazette, Mar. 3.]

CLARK, SARAH, Downham, Essex. April 12. Clark v Foster, Hall, V.C. Rooke and Sons, Lincoln's inn fields.
CLARK, SARAH, jun, Stock, Essex. April 12. Clark v Foster, Hall, V.C. Rooke and Sons, Lincoln's inn fields.
MANNING, GEORGE, Melbourne, in the Colony of Victoria, Gold Digger. July 31. Manning v Stone, Chitty, J. Lewis, Ely pl, Holborn.
MILLWARD, WILLIAM, Dudley, Worcester, Builder. April 4. Napier v Millward, Chitty, J. Warrington, Dudley.
ROBINSON, WILLIAM, Old Swan, near Liverpool, Basketmaker. April 5. Barlow v Lewis, Chitty, J. Killey, Liverpool.
TUTT, HENRY, East Barkwith, Lincoln, Farmer. Mar 30. Kent v Hibbitt, Hall, V.C. Toynbee and Co, Lincoln.
WEATHERHEAD, GEORGE, Newcastle upon Tyne, Paper Stainer. April 12. Allison v Moody, Chitty, J. Johnston, Newcastle upon Tyne.

[Gazette, Mar. 7.]

BROWN, JOHN HOLLADAY, Bournemouth, Southampton, Gentleman. Apr 3. Brown v Seeborn, Hall, V.C. Wootton and Son, Finsbury circus.
CREW, THOMAS, Christian Malford, Wilts, Cattle Dealer. Apr 12. Crew v Sla'ie, Hall, V.C. Pinniger and Co, Chippenham.
GILBERT, JOACHIM, Beaminster, George Gentleman. Apr 17. Daniel v Matthews, Hall, V.C. Leigh, Beaminster.
GILBERT SARAH, Beaminster, Dorset. Apr 17. Daniel v Matthews, Hall, V.C. Leigh, Beaminster.
MANSEL, ROBERT STANLEY, Devonshire pl, Esq. Apr 5. Mansel v Preston, Bacon, V.C. Steward, Lincoln's inn fields.
WEBBER, JOHN, Combe Florey, Somerset, Yeoman. Apr 12. Woolcott v Webber, Chitty, J. Webber, jun, Furnival's inn.
WILKINSON, JOHN, Chesterfield, Derby, Innkeeper. Apr 12. Chesterfield and North Derbyshire Banking Company v Rollinson, Chitty, J. Marsden, Chesterfield.
WROATH, MARY, Truro, Cornwall. Apr 13. Wroath v Pascoe, Bacon, V.C. Cock, Truro.

[Gazette, Mar. 10.]

BALLS, HENRY, Scarning, Norfolk, Gentleman. Apr 6. Lamer v Gilling, Chitty, J. Belfrage, John st, Bedford row.
FRERE, HENRY TOBIAS, Westbourne, Sussex, Esq. Apr 4. Frere v Allen, Chitty, J. Allen and Son, Carlisle st, Soho sq.
GOODEY, JOHN, Forest Gate, Essex, Builder. Apr 12. Goodey v Goodey, Chitty, J. Sadgrove, Mark lane.
MACDONALD, WILLIAM FERGUSON, Newmarket, Cambridgeshire, Professional Jockey. Apr 8. Lane v Macdonald, Bacon, V.C. Barlow, Nottingham.

RURBLE, JOHN, Southend, Essex, Gentleman. Apr 18. Allen v Patmore, Bacon, V.C. Rooke, Lincoln's inn fields.
SUNDERLAND, HENRY, Corringham, Lincoln, Farmer. Apr 15. Williams v Sunderland, Hall, V.C. Ward, Lincoln.
TAYLOR, WILLIAM, Misterton, Nottingham, Farmer. Apr 22. Danby v Taylor, Fry, J. Taylor, Epworth, Lincolnshire.
TAYLOR, WILLIAM, St Leonards, Exeter, Esq. Apr 15. Taylor v Ley, Hall, V.C. Du Cane, Gray's inn sq.
TRASK, WILLIAM, jun, Swarraton Farm, Northampton, Southampton, Farmer. Apr 15. Trask v Trask, Hall, V.C. Stocken and Jupp, Lime st.
WARD, THOMAS HENRY, Newcastle upon Tyne. Apr 5. Ward v Cummings, Bacon, V.C. Hoyle, Newcastle upon Tyne.

[Gazette, Mar. 14.]

CREDITORS UNDER 22 & 23 VICT. CAP. 25. LAST DAY OF CLAIM.

BACK, WILLIAM, Great Buckstep, Sussex, Esq. Mar 31. Harries and Co, Coleman st.
BAKER, RICHARD, Undy, Monmouth, Gent. Apr 8. Gustard, Usk.
BOWEN, Rev WILLIAM WHEELER WEBB, Camrose Vicarage, Pembroke, Clerk. Mar 31. Eaton-Evans and Williams, Haverfordwest.
BROWN, MARY, Spring Bank, Kingston upon Hull. Apr 11. Thorne, Hull.
BURGESS, JOHN, Gloucester, Gent. Mar 31. Bretherton and Son, Gloucester.
CARDELL, JOHN, St Erth, Cornwall, Yeoman. Apr 15. Cornish, Penzance.
CLARK, CHARLES, Stanford Rivers, Essex, Farmer. Apr 11. Ingle and Co, Threadneedle street.
CLIVE, GEORGE ARTHUR, Montford, Salop, Clerk in Holy Orders. Mar 25. Salt and Sons, Shrewsbury.
COMPTON, WILLIAM, Hastings, Provision Merchant. April 6. Parker and Pousford, Finsbury pavement.
COOTE, MICHAEL, Ashby-de-la-Zouch, M.D. May 1. Smith, Ashby-de-la-Zouch.
CURTIS, BENJAMIN GOUGH, Epsom, Surrey, Gent. Mar 30. Keith and Co, Norwich.
CUMING, GEORGE, Stonefield st, Islington, Stock Jobber. Apr 8. Warburton and De Paula, Finsbury circus.
DOBSON, SPANFORTH, Scarborough, Gent. Apr 5. Kitching, Scarborough.
ELMS, HANNAH, Marshfield, Gloucester. Apr 6. Inman and Inman, Bath.
DENISON, JOHN, Lincoln rd, Finchley, Gent. May 1. Mote, Walbrook.
GOVAN, ANDREW, Burton on Trent, Gent. Apr 1. Jennings and Co, Burton on Trent.
JACKSON, WILLIAM PARRY, Woolwich, Stationer. Mar 31. Chapman, Gresham bldgs, Basinghall st.
LAWSON, RICHARD, Falsgrave, Scarborough, Gent. Apr 5. Kitching, Scarborough.
ORSHAW, JONATHAN, Bury, Gent. Apr 8. Woodcock, Bury.
SAYLE, JAMES, Scarsdale villas, Kensington. March 31. Barnes, Colchester.
SMITH, MARY, Elizabeth, Preston. Mar 24. Dodd, Preston.
SPEAR, MALACHI, Wadebridge, Cornwall, Gent. Apr 12. Symons, Wadebridge.
TERNER, CHARLES HENRY, Dawlish, Devon, Esq. Apr 22. Whitborne, Dawlish.
VEAL, HARRIET, Keynsham, Somerset. Mar 25. Burne and Rooke, Bath.
WALKER, HENRY TORRENS, Weston super Mare, Colonel in the 25th King's Own Borderers. Apr 13. Dunster, Henrietta st, Cavendish sq.
WARE, JOSEPH, Preston, Innkeeper. Apr 15. Houghton and Myres, Preston.

[Gazette, Feb. 29.]

BOOTH, JAMES, Rochdale, Gent. May 1. Stott and Wallis, Rochdale.
CLARK, JAMES, Cambridge, Gardener. Mar 31. Wood and Co, Raymond bldgs, Gray's inn.
CROWLEY, JOHN LEATHAM, Wolverhampton, Gent. April 18. Thorne and Co, Wolverhampton.
DAVY, JOHN HENRY THOMAS, Wallbrook, Merchant. April 15. Drake and Co, Rood lane.
DENNEY, MATTHEW, Dalton-in-Furness, Gent. Apr 15. Remington, Ulverston.
ECHES, EDWARD, Litchurch, Derby, Esq. Apr 4. Paddock and Son, Hanley.
FREEMAN, JOSEPH, Tollereton, York, Yeoman. Apr 15. Phillips, York.
GIBBS, JOHN, Evesham, Worcester, Esq. May 1. New and Co, Evesham.
HAINES, WILLIAM, Campden, Gloucester, Gent. Mar 20. Hancock and Heron, Shipston on Stour.
HAMMOND, HARRIET, Freshford, Somerset. April 10. Gill and Bush, Bath.
HARTOPP, JANE MARY CRADOCK, Warwick sq, Pimlico. Apr 20. Harding, Westminster chbps, Victoria st.
HAWKINS, MATTHEW LAYERS, H.M.S. Hercules, Seaman. Apr 3. Poole and Co, Chancery lane.
HEAD, JOHN, Ipswich, Engineer. April 21. Notcutt and Son, Ipswich.
HEDDER, MARY ANN BUTT, Twickenham, Apr 10. Judge, Lincoln's inn fields.
HENRY, EMERSON WILSON, Whitehaven, M.D. Mar 31. Atter, Whitehaven.
HAWORTH, ELLEN, St Helen's, Lancaster. May 1. Andsell and Son, St Helen's.
JACKSON, JOHN, Padham, Lancaster, Retired Wheelwright. Apr 1. Eastham, Clitheroe.
KEELING, SAMUEL, Rochester, Stafford, Esq. April 4. Paddock and Sons, Hanley.
LAITY, THOMAS, Terrose, Mawnan, Cornwall, Farmer. Apr 8. Rogers, Falmouth.
LEWIS, HENRY, Green Meadow, Glamorgan, Esq. May 1. Williams, Cardiff.
LIVING, JOHN HENRY, Croydon, Gent. June 1. Waller and Sons, Coleman st.
MCNELL, THEODORE, Exeter. Mar 31. Tweedie, Lincoln's inn fields.
NOTLEY, ELIZABETH, Stogumber, Somerset. Apr 1. Clarke and Lukin, Chard.
PARKER, MARY AMIE CATHERINE, Lansdowne terr, Ealing. May 1. Johnsons and Co, Austin Friars.
POTTER, JAMES, Melksham, Wilts, Gent. Mar 31. Orford and Milne, Manchester.
PRIDHAM, GEORGE, Plymouth, Gent. Apr 12. Hutchings, Devonport.
PRIESTLEY, GEORGE, North Ferry, York, Gent. May 1. Hill and Des Forges, Hull.
RALPH, MARY ANN, Redland, Bristol. Mar 22. Jefferies, Bristol.
RIDDLE, SOPHIA, Clifton, Bristol. April 30. Wise, Bristol.
RILEY, WILLIAM, Over Darwen, Lancaster, Manager of a Print Works. Mar 22. Hindle, Darwen.
SOWER, HARRIET, King's sq, St Luke's. Apr 5. Boulton and Co, Clerkenwell.
SPENCER, WILLIAM, Uttoxeter, Stafford, Gent. Apr 8. Morgan, Stafford.
STAINES, SARAH, Lower Halford. Apr 13. Davies and Hunter, Sherborne lane.
TRUPP, HENRY WILLIAM, Tooley st, Merchant's Clerk. Apr 6. Watney and Co, Clement's lane.
TINKLER, GEORGE, Sileby, Leicester, Butcher. April 10. Stevenson and Son, Leicester.
WALKER, WILLIAM, Rochdale, Cotton Waste Dealer. May 1. Stott and Wallis, Rochdale.

[Gazette, Mar. 3.]

ALLISON, HENRIETTA, Retford, Nottingham. Apr 4. Ranson and Nelson, Sunderland.
BOARDMAN, JAMES, Stamford, Lincoln, Retired Farmer. Apr 20. Sturton, Holbeach.
BRITAIN, ELIZABETH CATHERINE, Clifton, Bristol. Apr 3. Brittons and Co, Bristol.
CHILD, HENRY, Paul's Bakehouse ct, Doctors' commons, Solicitor. Apr 4. Child, Paul's Bakehouse ct, Doctors' commons.
DAVENPORT, JOHN MARRIOTT, Oxford, Clerk of the Peace. May 1. Davenport, Oxford.
FITTON, THOMAS, Halifax, Gent. Apr 8. Welsh, Huddersfield.
FLETCHER, THOMAS, Long Eaton, Derby, Lace Manufacturer. May 1. Burton and Co, Nottingham.
GERHARD, JOHN, Romford, Essex, Veterinary Surgeon. April 4. Lea, Furnival's inn, Holborn.
GREENHILL, BENJAMIN CUTT, Knowle Hall, Bridgewater, Esq. May 1. Lovibond and Son, Bridgewater.
INGHAM, HENRY, Bailly, York, Rag Dealer. Apr 6. Ibberson, Dewsbury.
JACKSON, EDWARD, Bowdon, Chester, Gent. May 15. Allen and Co, Manchester.
JAY, GEORGE HARVEY, Westbourne st, Hyde pk, Esq. Apr 3. Galsworthy, Old Jewry chambers.
JONES, HESTER SUSANNAH, Fishguard, Pembroke. April 15. Price, Haverfordwest.
JONES, THOMAS PHILIP, Liverpool, Cigar Maker. March 31. Levy, Liverpool.
LIGHTFOOT, Rev NICHOLAS FRANCIS, Islip, Northampton, Clerk. May 15. Burnham and Henry, Wellingsborough.

MILLER, ANNE, Mansfield, Nottingham. April 15. Burton and Co, Nottingham.
 MONTGOMERY, THOMAS, Garrick st, Covent Garden, Stock Jobber. May 16. Macarthur and Co, John st, Bedford row
 RENDALL, WILLIAM, High st, Stoke Newington, Wheelwright. April 12. Sturt, Iron-monger lane
 SMITH, JOHN SAMUEL, Kingsford st, Kentish Town, Carpet Beater. April 11. Langley and Gibbon, Great James st, Bedford row
 SUMNER, ROBERT, Misterton, Somerset, Mason. April 10. Sparks and Blake, Crewkerne
 THOMAS, CATHERINE, Swansea, Draper. March 24. Thomas, Talbach
 WALSHAM, ROY CHARLES, Canon of York. June 1. Tidd-Praet and Davies, Kingston [Gazette, Mar. 7.]

ADDISON, ROY CANON BERKELEY, Newcastle upon Tyne, Clerk in Holy Orders. May 1. Mather and Co, Newcastle upon Tyne
 CHRISTIAN, JOHN ROBERT, Sway, nr Lynton, Southampton, Esq. April 15. Thomson and Edwards, Moorgate st
 CLARK, MARY ESTHER, Piccadilly. April 8. Clark, St. Swithin's lane
 FOLKARD, FREDERICK, Blackfriars rd, Pawnbroker. April 29. Freemans and Dicker, Gutter lane, Cheapside
 FOXCROFT, MARGARET ANNE, Wilmslow, Chester, Drysalter. April 18. Doyle, Manchester
 HADDOCK, WILLIAM, Birmingham, Potato Salesman. April 25. Makepeace, Birmingham
 HARVEY, JOHN FAGE, Wincheap, Canterbury. Aug 1. Dows, New inn, Strand
 KESSEAW, THOMAS BENTLEY, Camden rd, Coal Merchant. May 6. Chorley and Co, Moorgate st
 LEWIS, THOMAS, Caerphilly, Glamorgan, Boot and Shoe Maker. April 1. Williams, Cardiff
 MORTIMER, GEORGE, Edensor, Derby, Farmer. May 11. Taylor, Bakewell
 MOSLEY, MARY, Mount pleasant, Islington. April 16. Debenham, Lincoln's inn fields
 PUGH-JOHNSON, MARGARET ANN, Llanerchydol, Montgomery. May 1. Harrison, Welshpool
 READ, JOHN SANDS, Fyning, Rogate, Sussex, Gent. April 29. Johnson and Son, Midhurst
 REES, RICHARD, Abergavenny, Monmouth, Esq. April 1. Gabb and Walford, Abergavenny
 ROBERTS, EMMA CHAMPION, Kensington gore. April 30. Webb and Co, Argyl street, Regent st
 SHARPE, GEORGE, Llanelli, Breconshire, Ironmaster. April 1. Gabb and Walford, Abergavenny
 SHELLEY, ANNE, Withington, Lancaster. June 1. Jeans and Morgan, Manchester
 SMITH, JAMES HICKS, Brewood, Stafford, Barrister at Law. April 24. Waterhouse, Wolverhampton
 TOMKINS, MARY ANN, North Malvern, Worcester. May 1. Humphrys, Hereford
 WARD, THOMAS, Leeds, Builder. April 15. Middleton and Sons, Leeds
 WOLLASTON, CHARLES, Bury St Edmunds, Esq. June 7. Stevens, Queen Victoria st [Gazette, Mar. 10.]

LEGAL NEWS.

At the Mansion House Police Court on Monday, Mr. William Warwick King attended before the Lord Mayor upon four summonses at the instance of the Incorporated Law Society, charging him with an infringement of the 12th section of the Attorneys and Solicitors Act, 1874, which provides that any person who wilfully and falsely pretended to be, or took or used any name, title, description, or addition implying that he was duly qualified to act as an attorney or solicitor, should be liable to a penalty not exceeding £10 for each offence. He pleaded "Guilty." Mr. C. O. Humphreys, solicitor, who appeared for the society, stated that the defendant had been practising as a solicitor at 68, Cheapside, and in the matter of a bankruptcy proceeding against a Mr. Cressall he had signed and attested a petition of the bankrupt, and made an affidavit and issued notices from his offices in the capacity of a solicitor. The formal proof of qualification as a solicitor was the production of a duly stamped certificate, which cost £9 a year to London solicitors and less to those in the country. The defendant had not taken out a certificate since 1878. The Incorporated Law Society had no animus whatever in the matter, but they had taken the case up as a public duty. The Act was passed for the protection of the profession and the public alike. He did not wish the court to impose a penalty of £10 for each of the four offences, but if Mr. King would undertake publicly to cease practising until he obtained a certificate only one penalty would be asked for. Mr. King, the defendant, said he was willing to give that undertaking, but as his circumstances had been very bad of late, he asked the court to allow him time even to pay a fine of £10. He promised to pay that amount within two months. The Lord Mayor said it was quite clear that the Act had been infringed, not only in one instance, but continuously and systematically, and he was sure that the prosecution would not have been instituted without good cause. He fined the defendant £10 and 8s. costs, with the alternative of six weeks' imprisonment. The fine was paid.

At the Stock and Share Auction Company's sale held on the 10th inst. at their sale-room, Crown-court-buildings, Old Broad-street, the following were amongst the prices obtained:—Oreogum Gold Mining £1 shares, 7s.; North D'Eresby Mountain Lead £1 shares, 5s.; West Mostyn Coal and Iron shares, 4s.; Grogwinton Lead Mining shares, 10s.; Organo's Gold Mines shares, 10s.; Dieu Doane Gold Company shares, 1s. 6d.; Grey's Brewery £5 shares, £3 10s.; Kapanga Gold Mining Company of New Zealand, 5s.; Indian Trevelyan Gold Mining shares, 12s. 6d.; and other miscellaneous securities fetched fair prices. At their sale held on the 14th inst. the following were amongst the prices obtained:—Nundyroog Gold Mining £1 shares, 7s. 6d.; Indian Trevelyan Gold Mining £1 shares, 12s. 6d.; British Electric Light £10 shares, £9 15s.; Rhodes Reef Gold Mining £1 shares, fully paid, 16s. 3d.; Great Northern Rails Ordinary Stock 125½; New Zealand Kapanga Mines, 5s.; Woolwich Trams, £4; Aylesbury Dairies, £1 12s. 6d., and other miscellaneous securities fetched fair prices.

CHIPPIS' DAYLIGHT REFLECTORS.—Manufactory, 60, Fleet-street.—[ADVT.]

COURT PAPERS.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE.
ROTA OF REGISTRARS IN ATTENDANCE ON

Date.	COURT OF APPEAL.	V. C. BACON.	V. C. HALL.
Monday, March.....	20 Mr. Teesdale	Mr. Clowes	Mr. King
Tuesday.....	21 Farrer	Koe	Merivale
Wednesday.....	22 Teesdale	Clowes	King
Thursday.....	23 Farrer	Koe	Merivale
Friday.....	24 Teesdale	Clowes	King
Saturday.....	25 Farrer	Koe	Merivale
	Mr. Justice FRY.	Mr. Justice KAY.	Mr. Justice CHITTY.
Monday, March.....	20 Mr. Carrington	Mr. Jackson	Mr. Pemberton
Tuesday.....	21 Latham	Cobby	Ward
Wednesday.....	22 Carrington	Jackson	Pemberton
Thursday.....	23 Latham	Cobby	Ward
Friday.....	24 Carrington	Jackson	Pemberton
Saturday.....	25 Latham	Cobby	Ward

SALES OF ENSUING WEEK.

March 22.—Messrs. FAREBROTHER, ELLIS, CLARK, & Co., at the Mart, at 2 p.m., Freehold and Leasehold Properties (see advertisements, Feb. 25, p. 4, Mar. 4, p. 4, Mar. 11, p. 4.)
 March 22.—Messrs. EDWIN FOX & BOYSFIELD, at the Mart, at 2 p.m., Freehold and Leasehold Properties (see advertisements, Mar. 11, p. 4.)
 March 23.—Messrs. DALE & SON, at the Mart, at 2 p.m., Freehold, Copyhold, and Leasehold Properties (see advertisement, this week, p. 322).

BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, AND DEATHS.

BIRTHS.

JONES.—Mar. 13, at Bryn-y-mor, Hastings, the wife of C. Davenport Jones, solicitor, of a daughter.
 PEARSON.—Mar. 14, at Barrow-in-Furness, the wife of Henry Gwendolene Pearson, solicitor, of a son.

DEATHS.

BAIRD.—Mar. 15, at St. Aidan's, Fitzjohn's-avenue, Hampstead, John Forster Baird, of Bowmont-hill, Northumberland, barrister-at-law, aged 59.
 BUSHBY.—Jan. 19, at Horsham, Victoria, Wilfred Bushby, solicitor, formerly of Liverpool, aged 38.
 CHARLES.—Mar. 3, at 17, Orsett-terrace, Hyde park, G. George Charles, barrister-at-law, aged 48.
 HOARE.—Mar. 11, at 80, Caversham-road, N.W., Edward Hoare, solicitor, aged 61.

LONDON GAZETTES.

Bankrupts.

FRIDAY, March 10, 1882.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.

To Surrender in London.

Bowden, John, Mark lane, Corn Factor. Pet Mar 7. Murray. Mar 24 at 11
 Coulter, William Henry, Cambridge pl, Hyde pk, Builder. Pet Mar 6. Murray. Mar 24 at 11

To Surrender in the Country.

Allen, William Henry, Birmingham, Ironfounder. Pet Mar 6. Cole. Birmingham, Mar 23 at 2
 Bartley, Wallace, Rainhill, Lancaster, Commercial Traveller. Pet Mar 8. Bellringer. Liverpool, Mar 23 at 12
 Barton, Bethia, Werter rd, Putney. Pet Jan 17. Willoughby. Wandsworth, Mar 24 at 11
 Beevor, Thomas William, Little Yarmouth, Suffolk, Miller. Pet Mar 7. Worledge. Great Yarmouth, Mar 24 at 11
 Benns, Samuel Hewitt, Great Yarmouth, Farmer. Pet Mar 8. Worledge. Great Yarmouth, Mar 24 at 12
 Hayes, Thomas, Nottingham, Grocer. Pet Mar 8. Patchitt. Nottingham, Mar 21 at 2
 Hughes, William, Liverpool, Engineer. Pet Mar 6. Cooper. Liverpool, Mar 22 at 12
 Isaac, George, Great Yarmouth, Printer. Pet Mar 8. Worledge. Great Yarmouth, Mar 24 at 3
 McFall, George, New Brighton, Chester, Slater. Pet Mar 7. Williams. Birkenhead, Mar 22 at 10
 Spendlove, Robert, and Joseph Spendlove, Nottingham, Tea Merchants. Pet Mar 6. Patchitt. Nottingham, Mar 21 at 3

TUESDAY, March 14, 1882.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.

To Surrender in London.

Castro, Richard, Fann st, Aldersgate st, Printer. Pet Mar 1. Murray. Mar 31 at 11
 Kingham, George F., Bull and Mouth st. Pet Mar 9. Hazitt. Mar 29 at 11
 Stevenson, H. J., King's Arms yd, Moorgate st, Agent. Pet Mar 10. Pepsys. Mar 29 at 12.30
 Trendell, A. J. R., Science and Art Department, South Kensington. Pet Mar 10. Pepsys. Mar 29 at 12

To Surrender in the Country.

Gardner, Albert, Clifton ter, South Norwood, Builder. Pet Mar 10. Rowland. Croydon, Mar 28 at 2
 Joseph, Michael, Birmingham, Merchant. Pet Mar 10. Cole. Birmingham, Mar 30 at 2

BANKRUPTCIES ANNULLED.

TUESDAY, March 14, 1882.

Orrom, George Edward, and Jabez Bunting Quilter, Brixton rd, Boot and Shoe Dealers. Mar 11

Liquidations by Arrangement.

FIRST MEETINGS OF CREDITORS.

FRIDAY, March 10, 1882.

Angrave, Henry Alfred, Forest Side, Nottingham, Schoolmaster. Mar 22 at 4 at offices of Dowson and Wright, Week-day Cross, Nottingham
 Ashcroft, James, Preston, Hotel Keeper. Mar 23 at 11 at office of Fryer, Winckley sq, Preston

- Babbs, Richard, and Frederick Babbs, Castlemaine rd, Surbiton Hill, Builders. Mar 24 at 3 at 145, Cheapside. Saunders and Co, King st, Cheapside.
- Bailey, Michael, Longton, Stafford, Linen Draper. Mar 20 at 3 at offices of Hunt, Nicholas st, Portland st, Manchester. Adderley and Marlett; Longton.
- Baker, John Worrall, Liverpool, Restaurant Keeper. Mar 27 at 11 at offices of Sheen, North John st, Liverpool. Levy, Liverpool.
- Baldwin, Charles Joseph, Brighton, Tailor. Mar 23 at 3.30 at 145, Cheapside. Goodman, Brighton.
- Ball, Thomas, Bedminster, Bristol, Beerhouse Keeper. Mar 20 at 2 at offices of Nurse, Corn st, Bristol.
- Benson, William, East Butterwick, Lincoln, Innkeeper. Mar 22 at 1.30 at Angel Hotel, Market pl, Brigg. Rollit and Sons, Hull.
- Benson, William, and Robert Otter Benson, East Butterwick, Farmers. Mar 22 at 1 at Angel Hotel, Market pl, Brigg. Rollit and Sons, Hull.
- Bentley, John, Llanely, Carmarthen, Jeweller. Mar 27 at 11 at offices of Johnson and Stead, Church st, Llanely.
- Binns, Arton, Leeds, Woollen Manufacturer. Mar 22 at 2 at offices of Middleton and Sons, Calverley chmbrs, Victoria sq, Leeds.
- Booth, Joseph, Fentiman rd, Clapham rd, Schoolmaster. Mar 29 at 2 at offices of Armstrong, Chancery lane.
- Bowl, John, Bill Quay, Durham, Grocer. Mar 22 at 3 at offices of Warlow, Collingwood st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.
- Boxford, William James, Wood Seaves, Stafford, Farmer. Mar 23 at 3 at offices of Welsh and Son, Brown st, Manchester.
- Bradshaw, James, Tunbridge Wells, Tailor. Mar 23 at 12 at offices of Burton, Mitre et chmbrs, Temple.
- Broughton, John Northige, Boreham, Warminster, Wilts, Schoolmaster. Mar 22 at 11.30 at Townhall, Warminster. Wakeman and Bleck, Warminster.
- Campbell, George Murray, Crook, Durham, Ironmonger. Mar 27 at 11 at Three Tuns Inn, Durham. Milburn, Crook.
- Chappell, Sam, Huddersfield, Beerhouse Keeper. Mar 22 at 3 at offices of Welsh, Queen st, Huddersfield.
- Clark, Thomas, Watford, Grocer. Mar 22 at 2 at offices of Cogswell and Corp, Argyll st, Regent st.
- Coles, Henry Case, Southampton. Mar 23 at 3 at offices of Pearce, High st, Southampton.
- Comber, William, High Holborn, Carver and Gilder. Mar 30 at 12 at offices of Plunkett and Lender, St Paul's chyd.
- Conery, William, Holmfirth, York, Draper. Mar 23 at 3 at offices of Booth, Holmfirth.
- Cooper, Job, Bridgnorth, Salop, Licensed Victualler. Mar 22 at 2.30 at the Crown Hotel, Bridgnorth. Phillips and Co.
- Corbett, James Fletcher, Olton, Warwick, Coal Merchant. Mar 23 at 3 at the Great Western Hotel, Colmore row, Birmingham. Fitter, Birmingham.
- Crews, John, Twerton, Somerset, Commercial Traveller. Mar 25 at 12 at No. 8 Edgar buildings, Bath. Simmons and Co, Bath.
- Crossman, George, Dewsbury, York, Warehouseman. Mar 22 at 10.15 at offices of Scholes and Son, Wakefield rd, Dewsbury.
- Crouch, Edward Guilder, Essex st, Mare st, Hackney, Leather Merchant. Mar 29 at 3 at offices of Pratt and Norton, Old Jewry chmbrs. Montagu, Bucklersbury.
- Dent, Henry, Cockermouth, Cumberland, Joiner. Mar 28 at 11 at offices of Benson, Cockermouth.
- Denton, Frederick Samuel, Bradford, Ironmonger. Mar 23 at 3 at offices of Killick and Co, Commercial Bank bldgs, Bradford.
- Dickinson, Henry, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Woollen Merchant. Mar 23 at 2 at offices of Aitchison, Collingwood st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.
- Dowse, Robert, Easterton, Wilts, Farm Bailiff. Mar 24 at 12 at office of Norris and Hancock, Market pl, Devizes.
- Dugard, Rev Thomas, King Edward st, Hackney. Mar 27 at 3 at office of Hollams and Co, Mincing lane.
- Dyson, Joseph, Kingston upon Hull, Licensed Victualler. Mar 21 at 12 at offices of Walker and Spink, Parliament st, Kingston upon Hull.
- Edwards, Henry John, Ryde, Surgeon. Mar 24 at 2 at Douch's Railway Hotel, Taunton. Edwards, Sidmouth.
- Edward, Thomas Henry, Devonport, Wine Merchant. Mar 23 at 12 at Inns of Court Hotel, Holborn. Gard, Devonport.
- Ellison, Jonathan, Aspull, Lancaster, Joiner. Mar 25 at 10 at office of Lees, King st, Wigan.
- Emerson, George, Tomlin's grove, Bow, Clerk. Apr 3 at 1 at Fenchurch House, Fenchurch st. Neal, Lime st.
- Farlam, John, Carlisle, Grocer. Mar 22 at 11 at office of Johnson, Bank st, Carlisle.
- Feary, James, Uppingham, Rutland, Beer Dealer. Mar 24 at 10 at office of Law, St Mary's pl, Stamford.
- Foreman, Alfred Thomas, and Frederick John Foreman, Marden, Kent, Traction Engine Owners. Mar 22 at 3 at the Star Hotel, High st, Maidstone. Chambers, Hastings.
- Forge, Henry, Pavement, West Green rd, Tottenham. Provision Merchant. April 3 at 2 at Mason's hall Tavern, Mason's avenue, Basinghall st. Hopkins, Walbrook.
- Gamble, William, Liverpool, Boot and Shoe Maker. Mar 22 at 3 at office of Gibson and Bolland, South John st, Liverpool. Smith and Son, Liverpool.
- Gausby, John Baker, Bread st, Cheapside, Art Metal Worker. Mar 29 at 12 at the Queen's Hotel, Stephenson pl, Birmingham. Saunders and Bradbury, Temple row, Birmingham.
- George, Joseph, Ladbroke grove, Notting hill, Plumber. Mar 24 at 3 at office of Jourdain, Ludgate hill.
- Golding, William, Bardwell, Suffolk, Farmer. Mar 25 at 1 at Angel Hotel, Bury St Edmunds. Walpole, Bury St Edmunds.
- Goodwin, Edwin, East Bergholt, Suffolk, Butcher. Mar 27 at 4 at office of Jones and Son, Townhall chmbrs, Colchester.
- Graham, Susanna Jane, Epsom, Stationer. Mar 27 at 3 at office of Haigh and Agn, Gresham st.
- Gray, George, Pavilion Hotel, Notting hill, Licensed Victualler. Mar 29 at 2 at office of Layton and Co, Badge row.
- Griffiths, William Henry, Tipton, Stafford, Shopkeeper. Mar 22 at 11 at office of Travis, Church lane, Tipton.
- Hall, Henry Edward, Minchinhampton, Gloucester, Clerk. Mar 23 at 12 at offices of Smith and Stafford, Stroud.
- Harding, William, Tisbury, Wilts, Coal Merchant. Mar 31 at 11.30 at offices of Rutier, Shaftesbury.
- Henry, James, Exeter, Grocer. Mar 23 at 11 at Craven's Hotel, Craven st, Strand. Friend, Exeter.
- Hilditch, William, Liverpool, Provision Dealer. Mar 24 at 12 at Law Association Rooms, Liverpool. Ashton and Jolliffe, Rancorn.
- Hill, Dudley, Oldswinford, Worcester, Horse Nail Maker. Mar 22 at 11 at offices of Price, Stourbridge.
- Hirst, John, Manchester, Builder. Mar 16 at 11 at offices of Williams, Manchester. Barron, Manchester.
- Hirst, Samuel Tetley, Barnsley, Provision Merchant. Mar 27 at 2 at offices of Rideal, Barnsley.
- Hodgson, John, Leeds, Picture Dealer. Mar 21 at 2 at offices of Pullan, Albion st, Leeds.
- Hone, Henry, Adderbury, Oxford, General Dealer. Mar 24 at 3 at offices of Smith, Banbury.
- Howarth, James, Gauxholme, Lancaster, Farmer. Mar 23 at 2 at Mitre Hotel, Manchester. Eastwood, Todmorden.
- Howell, John, Bath, Umbrella Maker. Mar 24 at 12 at office of Cowan, Henrietta st, Covent Garden. Tucker, Bath.
- Hunt, George Clayton, Colcheth, Lancaster, Farmer. Mar 24 at 11 at office of Parker and Stocks, Norfolk st, Manchester.
- Jackson, William, Middlesborough, York, Butcher. Mar 20 at 11 at offices of Robson, Linthorpe rd, Middlesborough.
- James, Isaac, Woodchester, Gloucester, Baker. Mar 22 at 11 at offices of Stephens, Lansdown, Strand.
- Johnson, Thomas, Erleigh, Sonning, Berks, Butcher. Mar 23 at 11 at Queen's Hotel, Friar st, Reading. Dodd, Reading.
- Judd, Henry Kerridge, Little New st, St. Bride st, Publishers' Bookbinder. Mar 22 at 3 at Law Institution, Chancery lane. Paterson, Bouverie st, Fleet st.
- Laughton, Henry John, Sheffield, Wholesale Fruit Merchant. Mar 22 at 3 at offices of Clegg and Sons, Victoria chmbrs, Figtreet lane, Sheffield.
- Lawlan, Alexander, South Shields, Eating House Keeper. Mar 23 at 3 at offices of Marshall, King st, South Shields.
- Lawrence, Joseph, Birmingham, Marble Merchant. Mar 24 at 12 at office of Jelf, Waterson st, Birmingham.
- Littlewood, David, Hemsley, Norfolk, Farmer. Mar 23 at 3 at office of Cowl, South Quay, Gt Yarmouth.
- Mackie, Edward, Warrington, Lancaster, Draper. Mar 24 at 3 at offices of Davies, Market pl, Warrington.
- Male, William, Cottenham, Cambridge, Farmer. Mar 23 at 3 at offices of Turner, St Andrew's st, Cambridge.
- Marskell, Samuel, Langford, Bedford, Market Gardener. Mar 30 at 3 at Swan Hotel, Biggleswade. Wade and Andrews, Hitchin.
- McNeill, Hector, Bromwich, Oil and Colour Merchant. Mar 27 at 11 at offices of Peat, Newhall chmrs, Newhall st, Birmingham.
- Metcalf, James, Scarborough, Watchmaker. Mar 22 at 3 at offices of Watts and Kitching, Queen st, Scarborough.
- Mitchell, Charles, Framingham Pigot, Norfolk, Merchant. Mar 22 at 12 at offices of Coak and Co, Bank Plain, Norwich.
- Mosey, Francis, Leeds, Coachbuilder. Mar 23 at 11 at offices of Maud, Albion st, Leeds.
- Mounfield, William Bowson, Chester, Grocer. Mar 21 at 11 at offices of Price, Eastgate st, Chester. Brassey, Chester.
- Murray, Donald, Barrow in Furness, Ale, and Porter Dealer. Mar 22 at 2 at Trevelyan Temperance Hotel, Dalketh st, Barrow in Furness. Sims, Barrow in Furness.
- Musgrove, James, Lanchester, Durham, Innkeeper. Mar 21 at 12 at offices of Holmes and Robson, Pilgrim st, Newcastle upon Tyne.
- Nicholas, James, Henby, Pembroke, Licensed Victualler. Mar 22 at 2 at office of Hancock, Quay st, Bristol.
- Onyon, John, Waddington, Lincoln, Bricklayer. Mar 22 at 11 at office of Durance, Mint lane, Lincoln.
- Palmer, James, Bromwich, Edge Tool Maker. Mar 20 at 11 at office of Stokes, Bennetts hill, Birmingham.
- Patton, John, Ightham, nr Sevenoaks, Licensed Victualler. Mar 25 at 12 at Railway Hotel, Maidstone. Hopkins, Walbrook.
- Perrott, Alfred Rosser, Crickhowell, Brecon, Hotel Keeper. Apr 3 at 10 at Bear Hotel, Crickhowell. Browne, Aberavenny.
- Pinkish, Henry, Hove, Monumental Sculptor. Mar 24 at 11 at office of Cooper and Williams, Middle st, Brighton.
- Pye, John, Rainford, Lancaster, Grocer. Mar 24 at 3 at Wellington Hotel, New Market pl, St Helen's. Marsh, St Helens.
- Rampton, Charles, Farnham, Surrey, Watchmaker. Mar 20 at 1 at Anderton's Hotel, Fleet st, Durbidge, Guildford.
- Rhodes, Thomas, and William Rhodes, Shipley, Builders. Mar 21 at 11 at Leuchter's Restaurant, Darley st, Bradford. Morgan, Bradford.
- Richards, William Glaskin, Leicester, Grocer. March 23 at 12 at office of Hincks, Bowling Green st, Leicester.
- Ridd, Robert, Dunsthorpe, Devon, Physician. Mar 29 at 3 at office of Fewings, Queen st, Exeter. Friend, Exeter.
- Robertson, David, Liverpool, Shipwright. Mar 24 at 2 at offices of Davies, the Temple, Dale st, Liverpool.
- Rooms, Edward Alfred James, Portsea, Hants, Fruiterer. Mar 23 at 4 at offices of Whitehall, Union st, Portsea.
- Ryan, Walter James, Imperial arcade, Ludgate circus, Washing Machine Agent. Mar 21 at 3 at Cooper and Co, Lincoln's inn fields.
- Sabin, William Edward, and Henry Sendell Jennings, Manchester, Innkeepers. Mar 22 at 3 at offices of Ellis, Clarence bldgs, Booth st, Mosley st, Manchester.
- Sayer, Charles, Liverpool, Quarry Proprietor. Mar 27 at 3 at Law Association Rooms, Cook st, Liverpool. Parkinson, Liverpool.
- Scrivener, William, Cambridge rd, Mile End, Corn Dealer. Mar 23 at 2 at offices of Mote, Walbrook.
- Shackleton, William, Spring Wood Mill, near Todmorden, York, Cotton Spinner. Mar 23 at 11 at Queen Hotel, Todmorden. Craven, Todmorden.
- Shaw, Thomas, Haughton, Lancaster, Licensed Victualler. Mar 24 at 3 at offices of Smith and Brother, Hyde lane, Hyde.
- Shemill, Thomas, Bucknell, Stafford, Beerhouse Keeper. Mar 22 at 3 at offices of Tennant and Co, Cheapside, Hanley.
- Sheppard, James, Guildford, Surrey, Printer. Mar 23 at 12 at offices of Fraser, Moor-gate.
- Small, Andrew, Ludlow, Salop, Boot Maker. Mar 24 at 2.30 at offices of Southern and Montford, Ludlow.
- Smalcombe, Edwin, Ramford Courtenay, Devon, Licensed Victualler. Mar 25 at 3 at offices of Prickman, Okehampton.
- Spasbett, Alfred, Kirkley, Suffolk, Fish Merchant. Mar 22 at 1 at Suffolk Hotel, Lowestoft. Hill, Lowestoft.
- Stake, Francis, and Alfred Drake, Bradford, Stone Merchants. Mar 20 at 11 at offices of Gardiner and Jeffery, Bradford.
- Starkey, Thomas Cook, Kingston-upon-Hall, Bricklayer. Mar 23 at 3 at offices of Singleton, Kingston-upon-Hall.
- Stevenson, John Alfred, Brighton, Boot Maker. Mar 23 at 2 at 145, Cheapside. Goodman, Brighton.
- Stratford, William Victor, Lakenbrake, Suffolk, Schoolmaster. Mar 25 at 12 at Guildhall, Bury St Edmunds. Salmon and Son, Bury St Edmunds.
- Summers, William, Ightham, Kent, Farmer. Mar 22 at 12 at offices of Drake and Co, New Bridge st, Ludgate circus. Norton and Son, Town Malling.
- Terry, Thomas, South Norwood, Paper Hanger. Mar 29 at 3 at offices of Elborough and Dean, Queen Victoria st.
- Towers, William, and George Hodgson, Netherton, Cumberland, Builders. Mar 25 at 11 at office of Paisley, Bridge st, Workington.
- Travell, William Alfred, Gloucester, Shipbroker. Mar 22 at 11.30 at Henderson, Berkeley st, Gloucester.
- Trotter, William, Thornton Steward, York, Farmer. Mar 23 at 1 at Clay's Railway Hotel, Romanby, Northallerton. Jefferson, Northallerton.
- Wadsworth, James Edward, Leeds, Woollen Manufacturer. Mar 22 at 3 at offices of Middleton and Sons, Calverley chmbrs, Victoria sq.
- Walker, Alfred, Sutton, Worcester, Farmer. Mar 21 at 3 at Miller and Corbet, Church st, Kidderminster.
- Walker, Caleb, Liverpool, Dealer in India Rubber Manufactures. Mar 29 at 2 at the Law Association Rooms, Cook st, Liverpool. Forshaw and Hawkins, Harrington st, Liverpool.
- Walker, Frederick, sen, Swannington, Leicester, Farmer. Mar 24 at 3 at office of Wright, Belfour st, Leicester.
- Walton, Israel, Haslingden, Lancaster, Yarn Agent. Mar 24 at 3 at office of Addleshaw and Warburton, Norfolk st, Manchester.
- Ward, William Scott, Newtown, Montgomery, Licensed Victualler. Mar 23 at 2 at office of Woosnam, the Bank, Newtown.
- Warne, Henry, Hunstanton, Norfolk, Grocer. Mar 22 at 12 at offices of Seppings, King st, King's Lynn.
- Weinstein, David, Birmingham, Draper. Mar 20 at 12 at offices of East, Temple st, Birmingham.

White, Henry William, East Coatham, York, Grocer. Mar 16 at 12 at offices of Thompson, High st, Redcar
 Wilkes, Charles, 61 Ormond yd. Bloomsbury, Wheelwright. Mar 29 at 3 at offices of Fitch, Bedford row
 Wolfbergen, Louis, Mile End rd, Butcher. Mar 20 at 12 at office of Pannell and Co, Basinghall st. Catlin, Wornwood st
 Wood, Thomas, Ashton-under-Lyne, Hay and Straw Dealer. Mar 23 at 3 at offices of Nadin, King st, Manchester
 Wright, Edward, Victoria rd, Tottenham, Builder. Mar 28 at 2 at South pl Hotel, South pl, Finsbury. Barfield, Finsbury pavement
 Yates, Henry, Hampton, Builder. Mar 20 at 3 at offices of Rowland, Clement's-inn, Strand

TUESDAY, March 14, 1882.

Armor, Richard, Llangynhafal, Denbigh, Farmer. Mar 27 at 2 at 24, Well st, Ruthin.
 Edwards
 Arnell, William, Starcross, Devon, Tailor. Mar 25 at 11 at office of Southcott, Post Office st, Exeter
 Asher, Alfred, Leicester, Shopkeeper. Mar 29 at 3 at office of Buckby, Gallowtree gate, Leicester
 Ashmore, John, Manchester, Joiner. Mar 30 at 3 at office of Gregory and Ramsdale, York st, Manchester. Tucker, Manchester
 Aspin, Thomas, Rotherfield, Sussex, Licensed Victualler. Mar 31 at 4 at office of Russ, Mount pleasant, Tunbridge Wells
 Ayres, John, Princes Bisborough, Bucks, Farmer. Mar 29 at 3 at office of Parrett, Aylesbury. Smeathan
 Babbs, Richard, and Frederick Babbs, Castlemaine rd, Peckham, Builders. Mar 24 at 3 at 145, Cheapside. Saunders and Co, King st, Cheapside
 Bakes, Robert, Robertown, York, Innkeeper. Mar 27 at 11 at office of Clough, Railway st, Cleckheaton
 Baldwin, James, Flaunden, Hert, Wheelwright. Mar 29 at 11.30 at office of Bullock and Penny, 61, Borkstead
 Balls, Edward Draper, Lowestoft, Suffolk, Licensed Victualler. Mar 30 at 12 at offices of Seago and Son, High st, Lowestoft
 Burgess, Robert William, Frating, Essex, Tailor. Mar 27 at 11 at offices of Gody and Son, North hill, Colchester
 Burns, Thomas, Walsall, Stafford, Spring Bar Manufacturer. Mar 31 at 11.30 at offices of Sheldon, High st, Wednesbury
 Cattermoul, Henry, Albany st, Regent's Park, Fancy Salesman. Mar 26 at 12 at offices of Sampson, Marylebone rd
 Christmas, Charles Gilmore, and Sarah Jane Turner, Titchfield, Hants, Milliners and Dressmakers. Mar 27 at 3 at office of Goble and Warner, Fareham
 Clarke, Joseph Frederick, Ramsgate, Gas Fitter. Mar 28 at 2 at High st, Ramsgate. Mercer
 Clarke, Michael, Birmingham, Scrap Iron Dealer. Mar 25 at 11 at offices of Buller and Bickley, Bennett's-hill, Birmingham
 Cobbe, Joseph Edward, Christchurch, Southampton, Photographer. Mar 28 at 1.30 at Anderson's Hotel, Fleet st. Sharp, Christchurch
 Collis, Henry, Lower Sloane st, Chelsea, Farrier. Mar 24 at 12 at offices of Harrison, Pancras lane, Queen st
 Coxon, George, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Valuer. Mar 22 at 2 at office of Thomas and Co, Post Office chmbrs, St Nicholas sq, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
 Crozier, Thomas, Hutton Cranswick, York, Farmer. Mar 25 at 10 at offices of Jennings and Co, Gt Driffield
 Crump, William Charles, Woodford gn, Essex, Coal Dealer. Mar 23 at 3 at offices of Sydney, Guildhall chmbrs, Basinghall st
 Cunningham, Edward, Leytonstone, Essex, Builder. Mar 22 at 12 at Swan Inn, Stratford. Dewy, Mark lane
 Davis, John, Bilton, Gloucester, late Secretary to a Company. Mar 18 at 11 at offices of Essery, Bristol
 Dean, George James, Upper Norwood, Surrey, Builder. Mar 27 at 3 at Masons' Hall Tavern, Basinghall st. Swain, Old Jewry
 Dewes, Henry, Nuneaton, Warwick, Solicitor. Mar 30 at 12 at offices of Hughes and Masser, Coventry
 Dyer, Silas, Northampton, Grocer. Mar 24 at 3 at offices of Shoosmith, Newland, Northampton
 Edmonds, Edwin, Wandsworth rd, Furniture Dealer. Mar 30 at 3 at 145, Cheapside. Van Sandau and Co
 Emmerson, Hiram John, Hastings, Ironmonger. Mar 30 at 2 at Inns of Court Hotel, High Holborn. Letts Brothers, Bartlett's bldgs
 Escott, Richard, Bridgewater, Somerset, Builder. Mar 24 at 11 at offices of Chapman, Bridgewater
 Evans, Walter, North Ormesby, York, Tailor. Mar 24 at 11 at offices of Robson, Linthorpe rd, Middlesbrough
 Faux, Jane, Whittington, Norfolk, Grocer. Mar 30 at 12 at County court house, Downham Market. Reed and Wayman, Downham Market
 Fleck, Franz Philip, Elgin rd, Paddington, Baker and Confectioner. Mar 30 at 2 at Guildhall Tavern, Gresham st. Tilling, Bishopgate st Without
 Fountain, William Richard, High Wycombe, Bucks, out of business. Mar 24 at 2 at 25, High st, High Wycombe. Rawson, Great Marlow
 Foxon, John, Leicester, out of business. Mar 27 at 12 at offices of Harvey, Selborne bldgs, Millstone lane, Leicester
 Freeman, Edward Joshua, Norwich, Commercial Traveller. Mar 27 at 12 at offices of Miller and Co, Bank chmbrs, Norwich
 Frickenhaus, Augustus, Old Broad st, Commission Agent. Mar 28 at 12 at offices of James and Edwards, Coleman st. Orgill, Bedford row
 Gain, David, Seething lane, Butcher. Mar 29 at 2 at offices of Broad and Co, Queen st, Cheapside. Heplurn & Co, Bird-in-Hand ct, Cheapside
 Garland, Elijah, and Attribus Peter Jay, Bilton, Gloucester, Boot and Shoe Maker. Mar 21 at 12 at offices of Phillips, Small st, Bristol. Nurse, Bristol
 Gembitski, Samuel, Manchester, Tobacconist. Mar 24 at 3 at offices of Sampson, South King st, Manchester
 Goldstone, George, Chelmsford, Essex, Painter. Mar 28 at 12 at offices of Whites and Co, Budge row, Cannon st. Meggy, Chelmsford
 Goode, George Gower, Bedminster, Somerset, out of business. Mar 27 at 2 at offices of Hobbs, Clare st, Bristol
 Graham, William, Mundeville, Durham, Innkeeper. April 4 at 11 at offices of Wilkes and Wilkes, Northgate, Darlington
 Groves, Elizabeth Alice, Manchester, Dealer in Smallwares. Mar 24 at 3 at offices of Grundy and Co, Booth st, Manchester
 Guhani, Henry, Langham Hotel, Portland pl, no occupation. March 27 at 2 at offices of Lando and Co, Coleman st
 Hall, Benjamin, Huddersfield, Woollen Manufacturer. Mar 29 at 3 at offices of Fenton and Co, Station st, Huddersfield
 Hall, Samuel, Oldham, Grocer. Mar 27 at 3 at offices of Buckley and Mattinson, Church lane, Oldham
 Hammond, John, Byfield, Northampton, Farmer. Mar 30 at 11 at the White Lion Hotel, Banbury. Davies, Southam
 Hampson, Alfred, Fairfield, nr Manchester, out of business. Mar 27 at 3 at the King's Arms Hotel, Spring gds, Manchester. Garforth, Dukinfield
 Harris, Moses, Leeds, Slipper and Boot Manufacturer. Mar 27 at 11 at offices of Lodge and Rhodes, Park row, Leeds
 Hayles, Henry, West Cowes, Isle of Wight, Oilman. Mar 30 at 11 at 85, Lugley st Newport. Pittis, Newport
 Hicks, Louisa, Bow rd, Hatter. Mar 23 at 3 at office of Mitchell, Thanet pl, Strand. Harrison, Pancras lane
 Hirst, John Horsfall, Gildersome, York, Grocer. Mar 28 at 2 at office of Horner and Edmondson, Wood st, Wakefield
 Rodges, Edwin Mortimer, Bristol, Carpenter. Mar 22 at 2 at office of Hobbs, Clare st, Bristol

Hoggard, William, Barton upon Humber, Lincoln, Shipwright. Mar 29 at 2 at office of Allen, Whitcross st, Barton upon Humber
 Holton, William, Highgate rd, Clerk. Mar 25 at 10.30 at office of Bridgford, Lincoln's inn fields
 Houghton, James, Swansen, Engine Driver. Mar 27 at 12 at office of Farrington, Princess st, Manchester
 Hughes, James, and William Moore, Austy, Boot and Shoe Manufacturer. Mar 29 at 3 at office of Hincks, Bowling Green st, Leicester
 Hutton, Frank Bruxby, Crewe, Chester, Butcher. Mar 27 at 11 at Chetwode Arms, High Town, Crewe. Martin, Nantwich
 Ironmonger, Edward, Barton-upon-Trent, Commercial Traveller. Mar 23 at 2 at office of Dewry, High st, Barton-upon-Trent
 Jalland, John Foster, Nottingham, out of business. Mar 29 at 3 at offices of Whittingham, Nottingham
 Johnson, James, Worlaby, Lincoln, Farmer. Mar 23 at 11 at Angel Hotel, Brigg. Mason, Barton-upon-Humber
 Johnson, Samuel, Nottingham, Grocer. Mar 28 at 2 at offices of Russell and Co, Old Jewry chmbrs. Cockayne, Nottingham
 Jones, Richard, Portmadoc, Carnarvon, Engineer. Mar 28 at 12 at offices of Allanson, Iron Seaton
 Jones, Thomas, Llangefni, Anglesey, out of business. Mar 29 at 1 at Bodorgan Arms, Bodorgan Station. Owen, Bangor
 Jones, William, Holyhead, Anglesey, Butcher. Mar 30 at 10 at Holyhead Public Coffee House, Holyhead. Roberts, Holyhead
 Jones, William, Llan, nr Llanelli, Clerk in Holy Orders. Mar 28 at 11 at 40, Thomas st, Llanelli. Rees and Co
 Kent, William, Chesterton, Stafford, Grocer. Mar 28 at 3 at offices of Hollinshead and Moody, Tunstall
 Kenworthy, Charles Edward, Rochdale, Dyer. Apr 6 at 3 at offices of Molesworth, Rochdale
 Klusman, Ernest, New Swindon, Wilts, Tobacconist. Mar 28 at 12 at offices of Bradford and Foote, New Swindon
 Lang, John Nicholas, Hoxton st, Hoxton, Boot Manufacturer. Mar 29 at 3 at Mason's Hall Tavern, Mason's avenue. Young, Newgate st
 Little, Joseph, Carlisle, Wine Merchant. Mar 29 at 11 at office of Hodgson, the Courts, English st, Carlisle
 Lobley, Benjamin, Morley, York, Cabinet Maker. Mar 28 at 2 at office of Butler and Middlebrook, Park sq, Leeds
 Lockwood, Thomas, Tunbridge Wells, out of business. Mar 27 at 11 at Guildhall Coffee house, Gresham st. Knocker, Sevenoaks
 Long, Eliza, Shanklin, Boarding House keeper. Mar 27 at 12 at Bugle Hotel, Newport. Morley, Cheapside
 Lowe, William Challand, Manchester, Greengrocer. Mar 30 at 3 at office of Steifox, Hilton st, Manchester. Tremewes, Manchester
 Magoris, Henry, Hartlepool, Grocer. Mar 23 at 3 at office of Todd and Harrison, Town wall, Hartlepool
 Martin, William, Tonbridge, out of business. Mar 23 at 2.30 at 2, East hill, Dartford. Palmer, Tonbridge
 Mathews, Richard, Compton, nr Newbury, Farmer. Mar 27 at 2 at Wheatsheaf Hotel, Reading. Lucas, Newbury
 Matley, Abel, Deighton, nr Huddersfield, Clerk. Apr 1 at 3.30 at office of Poole and Co, Princess st, Manchester
 Mottram, Charles, Clayton Bridge, nr Manchester, Brewer. Mar 28 at 3 at offices of Brett and Craven, Manchester
 Mulholland, William James, and William Clutworthy, Aldersgate st, Boot and Shoe Factors. Mar 22 at 3 at 15, Broad st, Northampton. Betts, Southampton st, Strand
 Newman, William, Landport, Hants, Baker. Mar 30 at 3 at offices of Casey, St George's sq, Portsea. Bramson, Portsea
 Noble, Frederick, Henry Marcellos, Piccadilly, Breeches Maker. Mar 30 at 2 at the offices of Bridger, Eastcheap
 Odling, Eliza, Burwell, Lincoln, Innkeeper. Mar 29 at 12.30 at offices of Wood, New at chmbrs, Louth
 Paget, Edward, Frisby-on-the-Wreake, Leicester, Licensed Victualler. Mar 27 at 3 at offices of Wright, Leicester
 Payne, Joseph, Bedford, Plumber. Mar 28 at 12 at offices of Whyley and Piper, Dame Alice st, Bedford
 Pendle, George, and Charles Waite, Golden sq, Woollen Merchants. April 24 at 2 at the Bell Institution, Chancery lane. Phelan, Lincoln's inn fields
 Phillips, Lancel, Poole, Dorset, Provision Dealer. Mar 24 at 3 at Red Lion Hotel, Wareham. Trevanion, Poole
 Povers, Thomas, Basingstoke, Hants, Saddler. April 3 at 1 at offices of Webb and Lear, Cross st, Basingstoke
 Rath, Albert, and Emil Rath, Ely, Cambridge, Watchmakers. Mar 31 at 2 at the Bell Hotel, Ely. Rogers, Ely
 Rice, George, Portsea, out of business. Mar 28 at 12 offices of Addison, Guildhall chmbrs, Pembroke-road, Portsmouth
 Rigby, James William, Preston, Weavers' Overlooker. Mar 30 at 3 at the Royal Oak Hotel, Market st, Chorley. Cullerall, Chorley
 Roberts, Frederick George William, Milton-next-Gravesend, Grocer. Mar 27 at 3 at offices of Mitchell, Windmill st, Gravesend
 Rowe, George, Spennymoor, Durham, Greaser. Mar 21 at 12 at offices of Neilson and Brown, John st, Sunderland. Brown, Sunderland
 Russell, Thomas, Scarborough, Carriage Driver. Mar 25 at 11 at offices of Appleyard, Newborough st, Scarborough
 Sellers, Matilda, Ashton on Ribble, Lancashire, Skip Manufacturer. Mar 27 at 3 at the County Court Offices, Winckley st, Preston. Edleston and Son, Preston
 Selway, John, Ashwick, Somerset, Butcher. April 3 at 3 at offices of Nalder, High st, Shepton Mallet
 Smith, Walter, Gosport, Hants, Coal Merchant. Mar 27 at 11 at offices of Blake and Reed, Portsea
 Spencer, Robert, Bailey, York, Rag Merchant. Mar 27 at 10.30 at offices of Law, Batley
 Stratton, John Locke, and Philip Julian Curtis, Fenchurch st, Merchants. Apr 5 at 3 at offices of Cooper Brothers and Co, George st, Mansion House. Hollams and Co, Mincing lane
 Sumner, William, Harpur st, Theobald's rd, Estate Agent. Mar 27 at 3 at offices of Child and Son, South sq, Gray's inn
 Sutcliffe, John, Oxenhope, nr Keighley, Fellmonger. Mar 28 at 2 at offices of Wright and Waterworth, Keighley
 Sutton, Julia Ellen, Dover, Licensed Victualler. Apr 3 at 3 at Royal Oak Hotel, Dover. Payn, Dover
 Tail, James, South Shields, Coffee Merchant. Mar 23 at 1 at offices of Hoyle and Co, Newcastle upon Tyne
 Taylor, Augustine, Low Valley, nr Barnsley, Shop Keeper. Mar 28 at 11 at offices of Gray, Barnsley
 Thompson, Joseph Ambrose, Middlesbrough, Merchants. Mar 24 at 12 at offices of offices of Green, Sunderland
 Todd, George, Birmingham, out of business. Mar 26 at 10.30 at offices of O'Connor Bennett's Hall, Birmingham
 Waddington, George, Leeds, Game Dealer. Mar 23 at 3 at offices of Granger and Raper, Bank st, Leeds
 Wade, John, Westmeon, Hants, Postmaster. Mar 25 at 3 at offices of Adams and Co, Jewry st, Winchester
 Walker, Joseph, King's Norton, Worcester, Gardener. Mar 27 at 3 at offices of Jaques Temple row, Birmingham
 Walsh, Joseph, Leverton st, Kentish Town, out of business. Mar 22 at 1 at Anderson's Hotel, Fleet st. Johnson, St Martin's ert, St Martin's lane
 Welshman, Robert Soden, and John Harris Welshman, Christchurch, Southampton, Ironmongers. Mar 29 at 12.30 at Anderson's Hotel, Fleet st

White, Henry Freshwater, Romford, Essex, Builder. Mar 27 at 11 at office of Haynes and Clifton, South st, Romford
 White, William Alfred, Gt Winchester st, Stock Broker. Mar 23 at 3 at office of Wetherfield and Son, Gresham bldgs, Guildhall
 Willett, Abraham, Ansty, Leicester, Boot Manufacturer. Mar 27 at 3 at office of Hincks Bowling Green st, Leicester
 Williams, John Lowther, Bristol, Draper. Mar 27 at 11 at office of Evans, Exchange Bldgs East, Bristol
 Williams, William Francis, Birkenhead, Block Maker. Mar 27 at 2 at office of Knowles, Cook st, Liverpool
 Wilson, Alfred, Calverley, York, Tailor. Mar 28 at 11 at office of Tunnicliffe, Market st, Bradford
 Wilson, Richard Henry, Andover, Southampton, Coal Merchant. Mar 27 at 3 at Star and Garter Hotel, Andover
 Wren, John Charles, Rollo lane, Turnham Green, Grocer. Mar 29 at 11 at Lea's, The Lindens, Oxford rd South, Gunnersbury
 Wright, John, Crutched Friars, Licensed Victualler. Mar 25 at 12 at office of Rose-Innes and Co, Billiter House, Billiter st

CONTENTS.

CURRENT TOPICS	307	The Attorney-General v. Gaskill	313
THE LIMIT TO THE DOCTRINE OF "TULK V. MOXHAY"	308	Ex parte Ward	313
THE BILLS OF SALE ACT AMENDED	309	In re Anglo	314
REVIEW	310	Marshall v. Schofield	314
CORRESPONDENCE	310	SOCIETIES	314
CASES OF THE WEEK—		LAW STUDENTS' JOURNAL	315
Mathias v. Yett	311	LEGAL APPOINTMENTS	315
Ex parte Solomon	311	COMPANIES	315
Wilkinson v. The Hull and Barnsley Railway Company	312	LEGISLATION OF THE WEEK	317
Berry v. Keen	312	CREDITORS' CLAIMS	317
		LEGAL NEWS	318
		COURT PAPERS	319
		LONDON GAZETTES, &c., &c.	319

SCHWEITZER'S COCOATINA,

Arti-Dyspeptic Cocoa or Chocolate Powder.
 Guaranteed Pure Soluble Cocoa of the Finest Quality, with the excess of fat extracted.

The Faculty pronounce it "the most nutritious, perfectly digestible beverage for Breakfast, Luncheon, or Supper, and invaluable for Invalids and Children."

Highly commended by the entire Medical Press.
 Being without sugar, spice, or other admixture, it suits all palates, keeps better in all climates, and is four times the strength of cocoas thickened yet weakened with starch, &c., and is IN REALITY CHEAPER than such Mixtures.

Made instantaneously with boiling water, a teaspoonful to a Breakfast Cup, costing less than a halfpenny.

COCOATINA & LA VANILLE is the most delicate, digestible, cheapest Vanilla Chocolate, and may be taken when richer chocolate is prohibited.

In tin packets at 1s. 6d., 3s., 5s. 6d., &c., by Chemists and Grocers.

Charities on Special Terms by the Sole Proprietors, H. SCHWEITZER & CO 10, Adam-street, London, W.C.

ON WEDNESDAY NEXT.

THE NEW RIVER COMPANY.

To Trustees and others.—Two-eighths of an Adventurer's Share, in 26 Lots, in this highly-important and lucrative trading corporation, producing a safe and constantly increasing annual income, with occasional bonuses; each lot forming a valuable Freehold Estate, conferring votes for the counties of Hertford and Middlesex, and affording to purchasers improving investments, unsurpassed by any other class of security.

MESSRS. FAREBROTHER, ELLIS,

CLARK, & CO. will SELL by AUCTION, at the MART, London, E.C., on WEDNESDAY, MARCH 22, 1882, at TWO o'clock precisely, TWO-EIGHTHS OF AN ADVENTURER'S SHARE IN THE FREEHOLD ESTATES and interest of the New River Company with its main watercourses, extensive reservoirs in and near the metropolis, landed and house property, ground-rents, buildings, wharves, privileges, commodities, and appurtenances (in possession and expectation) of this historic corporation. The income of the Company for the year 1881 was £461,670, or about £20,000 in excess of that of 1880, and the dividend on the 2-8ths Share now to be sold amounted to £629 1s. for the year ending Christmas, 1881, showing a progressive increase of about 5 per cent. per annum. Such revenue must still further increase, not only from the many building operations now being carried on in the district supplied by the New River, but from the termination of the ground and other leases of the Myddelton-square Estate in about 23 years, when the rental value will be greatly augmented. For the investment of trust moneys and safe employment of capital this is infinitely superior to any other class of property.

Particulars may be obtained of Messrs. Few & Co., Solicitors, 19, Surry-street, Strand, W.C.; at the Mart, E.C.; and of Messrs. Farebrother, Ellis, Clark, & Co., 5 and 6, Lancaster-place, Strand, W.C., and 18, Old Broad-street, E.C.

NORTHAMPTONSHIRE.—WOODFORD HOUSE ESTATE.

An important Freehold Residential and Sporting Property, with valuable beds of ironstone and other minerals, now being worked. With possession.

MESSRS. FAREBROTHER, ELLIS,

CLARK, & CO. will SELL by AUCTION, at the MART, E.C., on WEDNESDAY, APRIL 5, 1882, at TWO o'clock precisely, THE WOODFORD HOUSE ESTATE, a valuable FREEHOLD PROPERTY, comprising 742 acres of highly-productive land, situate in the parishes of Woodford, Twywell, and Cranford, five miles from Kettering, seven from Wellingborough, and within one mile of two stations on the Midland system, with a comfortable, stone-built mansion, containing three spacious reception rooms and 16 bed and dressing rooms, with adequate offices, stabling, outbuildings, and gardener's cottage, conservatory and pleasure grounds, good gardens, and a small undulating park surrounded by ornamental plantations. Three packs of hounds meet in the locality, and there are several noblemen's and gentlemen's seats in the immediate neighbourhood. Also three excellent farms, with two good homesteads and numerous buildings and cottages. The estate possesses great mineral importance, the principal portion being underlaid by some of the richest beds of iron ore and limestone in the county, which are fully open to view and are being vigorously worked under a lease granted at adequate royalties. The estate produces an income of about £2,800 per annum, including the estimated value of the mansion. Also, in three separate lots, valuable accommodation lands, cottages, and outbuildings, close to the village of Woodford.

Particulars may be obtained of Messrs. Walters, Devel, & Walters, Solicitors, 9, New-square, Lincoln's-inn, W.C.; Messrs. Hensley & Hensley, Solicitors, 5, Albany-court, Piccadilly, W.; Messrs. Green & Cheese, Solicitors, 2, Warwick-court, Charing-cross, S.W.; T. H. Burroughes, Esq., 30, Lincoln's-inn-fields, W.C.; at the Mart; and of Messrs. Farebrother, Ellis, Clark, & Co., 5 and 6, Lancaster-place, Strand, W.C., and 18, Old Broad-street, E.C.

ESTABLISHED 1825.

HEWETSON, THEXTON, & PEART,

MANUFACTURERS AND HOUSE FURNISHERS,

200, 203, and 204, TOTTENHAM COURT ROAD, W.

Estimates and Designs submitted free for entirely Furnishing Residences, Chambers, Offices, &c.
 —PAINTING, DECORATING, & HOUSE REPAIRS.—

Carved Oak Furniture, Reproductions from Ancient Designs, &c. Bedroom Furniture, including Bedstead and Bedding, from £7 10s. per set.

THIRTY LARGE SHOW ROOMS.

HEWETSON, THEXTON, & PEART.

200, 203, and 204, Tottenham Court-road, London, W.
 N.B.—Household Furniture Warehouse or Removed on reasonable terms.

WALTHAMSTOW.

A detached Freehold Residence for occupation, and a corner plot of Freehold Building Ground adjoining.

MESSRS. ELLIS & SON are directed by

the Trustee under the will of the late G. E. Miller, Esq., to SELL by AUCTION, at the MART, on MONDAY, APRIL 3, at TWO o'clock precisely, in Two Lots (unless previously disposed of by private contract), the Detached FREEHOLD RESIDENCE known as Norfolk Villa, delightfully situate in a retired spot in the Stanhope-road, within a few minutes' walk of the Hoe-street Station on the Great Eastern Railway. It contains five good bed rooms, dressing room, two waterclosets, good entrance hall, dining and drawing rooms, each about 17ft. by 12ft. 6in., one opening to a small greenhouse; usual offices and outhouses, a coach-house and stable, and pretty garden of about one-third of an acre, planted with well-grown trees; with immediate possession. And, adjoining, a very eligible corner plot of Freehold Building Ground, having a return frontage to the Stanhope-road of about 157ft.; also with possession.

To be viewed by orders only, to be had of Messrs. Ellis & Son. Printed particulars and conditions of sale to be had of Messrs. Fladgate, Smith, & Fladgate, Solicitors, 40, Craven-street, Strand; at the Mart; and of Messrs. Ellis & Son, Auctioneers and Estate Agents, 49, Fenchurch-street.

LIMEHOUSE.

Re Whitehead & Co. (Limited): In liquidation.—Important Waterside Manufacturing Premises, with vacant possession.

MESSRS. ELLIS & SON are directed to

SELL by AUCTION, at the MART, on MONDAY, APRIL 3, at TWO o'clock precisely (unless previously disposed of by private contract), the capital PREMISES known as Broadwater Wharf, most eligible situate in the Limehouse Cut and Thomas-street, Burdett-road, midway between Limehouse and Burdett-road Railway Stations. It possesses frontages to both the canal and the street of over 100ft., occupies nearly half an acre of ground, and comprises boiler house, workshop, kiln house, a modern two-floored warehouse about 90ft. by 30ft., and two newly-built cottages, the whole forming most complete premises, standing in a situation the approaches to which, by road, rail, and water, are unexceptionally convenient. Held on lease for an unexpired term of about 77 years at a low ground-rent.

May be viewed by orders, to be had of Messrs. Ellis & Son. Particulars, plans, and conditions of sale to be had of T. Theobald, Esq., Chartered Accountant, 28, St. Swithin's-lane, E.C.; of Messrs. Ashurst, Morris, Crisp, & Co., Solicitors, 6, Old Jewry; at the Mart; and of Messrs. Ellis & Son, Auctioneers and Surveyors, 49, Fenchurch-street.

PENTONVILLE.

Desirable small Leasehold Investment.

MESSRS. ELLIS & SON are directed by

the Trustee under the will of Mrs. Hellis, deceased, to SELL by AUCTION, at the MART, on MONDAY, APRIL 3, at TWO o'clock precisely, the commodious RESIDENCE, No. 3, Holford-square, one of the principal squares in the neighbourhood, standing in a high and healthy position, and very handy both for the City and West-end; let to Mr. J. Thompson, an old tenant, at the very moderate rent of £55 per annum, and held of the New River Company for an unexpired term of about 37 years, at the low ground-rent of 45 per annum.

Printed particulars may be had of Messrs. Sedgfield & Price, Solicitors, Abingdon, Berks.; at the Mart; and of Messrs. Ellis & Son, Auctioneers and Estate Agents, 49, Fenchurch-street.

Freehold, Copyhold, and Leasehold Investments in Dwelling Houses of a moderate class, all situated in thickly-populated localities where the demand is always greatly in excess of the supply.

MESSRS. DALE & SON will SELL by

AUCTION, at the MART, Tokenhouse-yard, Bank, E.C., on THURSDAY, MARCH 23, 1882, at TWO o'clock precisely, in Fourteen Lots, as follows:—

BERMONDSEY.—Five Freehold Houses, Nos. 55 to 59, Salisbury-street, Jamaica-road, let at per annum

The Colchester Arms Beer House (adjoining), let on lease at

The Freehold Corner House, No. 64, Mari-gold-street, Jamaica-road, let at 12s. 6d. per week

ROTHERHITHE.—Two Freehold Houses and corner Plot of Building Land at the junction of Swan-lane and Adam-street, estimated value per annum

ALDOATE.—Two Freehold Houses, Little Somerset-street

WAPPING.—Two Copyhold Tenements and small Plot of Land, Hilliard's-court, Old Gravel-lane

ST. GEORGE'S EAST.—Leasehold House, No. 4, Grove-street, Commercial-road, lease 21 years, ground-rent £3 3s. per annum, let at 10s. per week

STEPNEY.—11 long Leasehold Cottages, Nos. 1 to 11, Ball's-buildings, White Horse-street, lease 61 years, ground-rent £55, producing

PECKHAM.—Compact block of 17 long Leasehold Houses, Nos. 1 to 17, Clarkson's-place, Carlton-grove, lease about 40 years, ground-rent £34, producing per annum

GREENWICH.—11 Leasehold Houses, No. 5, Chester-street, Nos. 3 to 10, Carradock-street, and Nos. 1 and 2, Thornley-place, Marlborough-street. Also a Leasehold Ground

Rent, of 23 per annum arising out of No. 8, Chester-street, with the reversion to the last 10 years of term, lease 40 years, ground-rent £18 10s. per annum on the whole, let and producing per annum

£1,241 4 0

May be viewed, and particulars, &c., obtained on the premises; of J. Harwood, Esq., Solicitor, 91, Cannon-street, E.C.; of H. J. Golden, Esq., Solicitor, Lime-street-chambers, Lime-street, E.C.; the Auction Mart; and of the Auctioneers, 84, Mile-end-road, E.

SHOREDITCH.

To Trustees and others.—Valuable Freehold Ground-rents, amounting to £300 6s. per annum.

MESSRS. MASTERMAN, GIBBS, & CO.

will SELL by AUCTION, at the MART, Tokenhouse-yard, E.C., on MONDAY, APRIL 3, at TWO o'clock precisely, in Thirteen Lots, Valuable FREEHOLD GROUND-RENTS, amounting to £300 6s. per annum, fully secured upon property in the parish of St. Leonard, Shoreditch, with early reversion to the rack rentals, estimated at upwards of £2,200 per annum.

Particulars and conditions of sale may be had of Messrs. Masterman, Hughes, Masterman, & Rew, Solicitors, 59, New Broad-street, E.C.; at the Mart; and of the Auctioneers, 37, Walbrook, E.C.

AUCTION ROOMS

Specially for the Sale of Literary Property, Music, and Works of Art, 47, LEICESTER SQUARE, LONDON, W.C.

MESSRS. PUTTICK & SIMPSON beg to

announce that the above rooms are open daily for the reception of all kinds of Literary and Art Property, Musical Collections, &c., intended for Sale by Auction. Messrs. P. & S. feel assured that the necessary knowledge (gained only by long experience) and the extensive connection enjoyed by their firm will be a sufficient guarantee to solicitors and others that such property entrusted to their care will be arranged for sale in the most advantageous manner.

Valuations for Probate or Legacy Duty, or for Public or Private Sale.

ESTABLISHED (IN PICCADILLY) 1794.

HAMPTON & SONS make NO CHARGE

for inserting particulars in their FREE MONTHLY REGISTER OF ESTATES, TOWN and COUNTRY HOUSES, Furnished or Unfurnished, or for Sale, to be had GRATIS at their Offices, or post-free for two stamps. Published on the 1st of the month, and particulars for insertion should be sent not later than five days previous to end of preceding month.

Valuations for Probate and Transfer. Surveys. Estate and Auction Offices, 8, Pall Mall East, S.W.